

**REWRITING THE MIDDLE AGES
IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY**

Rewriting the Middle Ages in the Twentieth Century

Edited by

Jaume Aurell and Francisco Crosas

BREPOLS

© 2005, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2005/0095/21

ISBN 2-503-51719-6

Printed in the E.U. on acid-free paper

Contents

Editorial Note	7
<i>Introduction: Medievalism and Medievalists in the 20th century</i> (Jaume Aurell)	9
<i>Frederic William Maitland</i> (Natalie Fryde)	25
<i>Clemens Baeumker</i> (María Jesús Soto)	35
<i>Pierre Duhem</i> (Michael McVaugh)	57
<i>Ramón Menéndez Pidal</i> (Angel Gómez Moreno)	69
<i>Charles H. Haskins</i> (Julia Pavón)	87
<i>Etienne Gilson</i> (Alessandro Ghisalberti)	107
<i>Marc Bloch</i> (Massimo Mastrogregori)	117
<i>Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz</i> (José-Luis Martín)	149
<i>Ferran Soldevila</i> (Enric Pujol)	171
<i>Marie-Dominique Chenu</i> (Josep Ignasi Saranyana)	183
<i>Ernst H. Kantorowicz</i> (Francisco Javier Caspistegui)	195
<i>François Louis Ganshof</i> (Dirk Heirbaut and Aniceto Masferrer)	223
<i>Ugo Sesini</i> (Antoni Rossell)	243
<i>Raymond Klibansky</i> (Martin Thurner)	255
<i>Rafael Lapesa</i> (Miguel Ángel Pérez Priego)	271
<i>Robert S. López</i> (Paul Freedman)	279
<i>Georges Duby</i> (José Enrique Ruiz-Domènec)	295
<i>Jacques Le Goff</i> (Jean-Claude Schmitt)	305
<i>Albert Zimmermann</i> (Elisabeth Reinhardt)	317
<i>Conclusion</i> (Martin Aurell)	333
Notes on Contributors	345

Editorial Note

This volume gathers the contributions presented at the *Great Medievalists of the 20th Century* conference held at the Universidad de Navarra, Spain, from 14 to 16 May 2003. It fell to Jaume Aurell and Francisco Crosas to undertake the editing tasks, but the organisation of the congress was also the work of Raquel García Arancón and María Jesús Soto. All four are members of the *Instituto de Estudios Medievales* (Institute of Medieval Studies) at the Universidad de Navarra. This institute is an interdisciplinary centre which aims to gather together the various disciplines that converge into medieval studies. The idea of holding a congress devoted to the study of the greatest medievalists of our time in fact arose from within this Institute, in order to pay to them the tribute they deserve and to try to make the best use of the trail left by their teaching.

Contributions have been ordered following a chronological criterion marked by the date of birth of the medievalist whose life is being glossed. The chronologies and bibliographies are not intended to be comprehensive compilations, nor do they follow rigid uniform norms: the editors have given freedom to the authors for their elaboration, with the idea that they work as the complement of the respective texts.

We would like to express our gratitude to the *Facultad de Filosofía y Letras* of the Universidad de Navarra, which, from the very first moment, dispensed an enthusiastic welcome to the idea and furnished the necessary material means for the comfortable hosting of the Congress. Further collaboration has been forthcoming from the Spanish *Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología*, as well as from the Friendly Hand Foundation – and we thank Gabriel Pretus for all his attentions. Pía d’Ors, Teresa Grandal and María Narbona looked after various formal aspects involved in the edition of this book. We are grateful to Brepols publishing company for the trust they have placed in our project: we hope that this volume rises to the occasion of the great prestige acquired by these publishers during all these decades of publishing activity of the highest academic quality in the sphere of medievalism. Our gratitude to them, hoping that this will be the first in a long list of volumes to come, since to the medievalists chosen for this first volume we will doubtless have to add many others who have of necessity been left out from this selection.

Jaume Aurell and Francisco Crosas

Introduction

Medievalism and Medievalists in the 20th century

Jaume AURELL
(Universidad de Navarra)

“We are like dwarfs sitting on the shoulders of giants: we can indeed see more and further than they, not because of the sharpness of our vision or the height of our bodies, but because we have been raised up on high and carried aloft by their gigantic size”¹. Few phrases sum up better the spirit of the Middle Ages than this quotation from Bernard of Chartres. In a similar way, we academics gathered in this volume are prepared to climb onto the backs of the 20th century’s greatest Medievalists to follow the same path they first blazed with the purpose of beginning our work where they left off.

The two icons selected to illustrate the guide of the Conference which is published now – manifestations of medieval and modern art: Simone Martini, *Walls of Siena* and Edward Hopper, *The Modern City* – are graphic indicators of the two-fold aim of these sessions. The first objective is to study the main historic debates that arose over the course of the 20th century in the field of Medievalism. Knowledge of those who initiated these debates will no doubt help us to explore the issues in greater depth. The second objective, complementary to the first, is to trace the intellectual history of the last century by deepening our understanding of the life, context and works of its leading medieval scholars. This dual objective is reflected in the fact that our guest speakers are divided into medievalists and modernists.

But this diversity of objectives and historical specialities is also accompanied by a remarkable variety of disciplines and geographical origins amongst the participants at this congress. Gathered together here, for the purpose of studying a single scientific object, are historians, philosophers, philologists, theologians, linguists, art historians and legal historians working in different academic fields. This fact alone demonstrates the enormous interdisciplinary energy generated by Medievalism, and the subject’s ability to bring together work from the most diverse areas of human and social sciences. We can well say, therefore, that this subject is interdisciplinary both horizontally – with communication between different fields and disciplines engaged in studying medieval culture – and vertically, in view of the different historical periods our speakers study.

The first question that must be decided in a book of this kind is the problem of selecting which medieval scholars to study, what some have called the ‘canon’. It is no easy matter to decide the most representative medievalists of the 20th century. The medievalists included come from France, England, the United States, Italy, Germany, Belgium and Spain. No doubt, there are gaps in this selection, but it is

¹ Quoted in Lee Patterson, *Negotiating the Past: The Historical Understanding of Medieval Literature* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), p. 185.

also true that the principal disciplines are adequately represented, as are the intellectual traditions Medievalism has partaken of over the 20th century.

Amongst those we are to study are the leading exponents of the influential French historical school of the *Annales*, such as Marc Bloch, Jacques Le Goff and Georges Duby; representatives from the highest philosophical tradition, including Raymond Klibansky, Albert Zimmermann and Clemens Baeumker; economics and trade historians such as the Italian-American Roberto Sabatino López; historians of political thought such as the German Ernst Kantorowicz; exponents from the classical school of legal and institutional history such as the Belgian François Louis Ganshof and the British Frederic William Maitland; pioneering cultural historians such as the American Charles Homer Haskins, who carried out much of their work in the period between the wars; historians of theology and Christian philosophy such as the French scholars Etienne Gilson and Marie-Dominique Chenu; members of the Spanish historical and philology school, such as Ramon Menéndez Pidal, Rafael Lapesa and Claudio Sánchez de Albornoz and, in Catalonia, Ferran Soldevila; and, finally those from more minority but not for that less interesting fields of Medievalism such as the science historian Pierre Duhem and the music historian Ugo Sesini.

Logically enough, there may well be important gaps in this list of prestigious medievalists. It is indisputable, however, that the many fields of knowledge that converge in the study of the Middle Ages are, for the most part, represented here. This is a period, moreover, whose scholars require a truly pluridisciplinary formation. Indeed, one of the main aims of this volume is to demonstrate the pluridisciplinary nature of Medievalism. In fact, the many institutes of Medieval Studies established at many European and American universities in the 20th century were intended to encourage interdisciplinary work in an area, Medievalism, that requires a conjunction of methodologies and disciplines to enable any study of the period to be carried out with the necessary rigour and seriousness. The work of these institutes has proved highly effective in avoiding the excessive compartmentalisation of the many disciplines involved in studying medieval culture. Work in different areas is coordinated better and the formation of integral Medievalists made possible.

Etienne Gilson, Charles H. Haskins, Marc Bloch and Georges Duby, to mention just four of the great researchers whose lives are studied at this volume, never ceased to insist that the medievalist must engage in a dialogue with history, philology, philosophy, theology and aesthetics, as this is a field that, by its very nature, transcends the discipline itself. Without a deep interdisciplinary collaboration, it is very difficult to fully understand the complex world of medieval culture. The contemporary researcher must master or be familiar with the basic principles of the various disciplines that converge in Medieval Studies.

Another of the great objectives this volume sets itself is to delve deeper into the intellectual contexts in which the leading medievalists of the 20th century were formed. In this way, besides the strictly historiographical work involved in this study, we can also reach greater understanding of the writings which form part of these medievalists' legacy. Presentism is a reality that is always active in the work of the researcher into past times: inserted into each reading of the past is a reading of the present on which the historic discourse is built. True understanding of analyses of the past therefore depends on our knowledge of the conditions and the contexts in which these discourses were articulated.

The weight of the presentism in the historical texts

Some years ago, the American Medievalist Kathleen Biddick pointed out that presentism leads medievalists to a look into the mirror of the Middle Ages to reflect in it histories that, in reality, belong to modern and even post-modern times². Present-day artistic manifestations such as film or painting feature themes linked to the Middle Ages without the pejorative connotations of other times. Paradoxically, the medieval period is closer than ever to our times, though this closeness is often not explicitly shown. Presentism dominates over preterism, its opposite, in our relations with the medieval period, because we are capable of identifying the Middle Ages more as a mirror than as a mirage. Presentism brings us closer to the period studied, no matter how distant it may be, but it undoubtedly also has the possibly perverse effect of anachronistically applying the parameters of present culture in analysing it.

Any historical text – philosophical, theological, philological, linguistic, iconologic – clearly reflects the intellectual and ideological contexts of the period in which it was articulated, independently of the information provided about the object analysed. Ernst Kantorowicz's *Frederick II*, published in the late-1920s, responded to the atmosphere in a resentful Germany thirsty for firm leadership. The election of this haughty German medieval emperor reflected the concerns that occupied Germany in the 1920s and 30s. When the work was republished in Germany in the 1960s, the author himself was quick to manifest his discomfort, declaring that the work should be completely revised: the dramatic events unleashed in Germany in the 1940s and his residence in the United States in the 1950s had radically transformed his intellectual, ideological and political convictions and, therefore, his vision of history.

The influence of presentism – the weight of context in the historical text – is greater or lesser according to the degree of historical awareness in each period, but it always exists in one form or another³. The historicist theses of Benedetto Croce, Robin Collingwood and José Ortega y Gasset, developed in the intense period between the wars, were excessively radical, perhaps, but they did make clear the real weight of the present in the work of those who read the past. This legitimises and justifies historiographical studies such as this volume, because it is as important for a medievalist to treat the original sources on which they based their work as it is to have sufficient knowledge of the secondary bibliography, of those who proceeded him or her in their study of the particular subject.

What with the weight of presentism on our recovery of the past, it is understandable that Medievalism has come to be defined as not only the study of the Middle Ages, but perhaps more accurately, as the application of medieval models to contemporary needs and, on a third level, as the spirit of the Middle Ages that beats in all modern manifestations of art and thought. We need a new framework for Medievalism, considering it not only as the study of the medieval period in itself

² Kathleen Biddick, *The Shock of Medievalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), p. 83.

³ An excellent overall vision of presentism and its methodological and epistemological implications is found in William H. Dray, 'Some Varieties of Presentism', in *On History and Philosophers of History* (Leiden and New York: Brill, 1989), pp. 164-189.

but of the researchers, artists and writers that, over history, have built up the idea of the Middle Ages that we have inherited⁴.

The idea of the Middle Ages as seen from Modernity

The idea of the existence of a *Middle Age*, between the classical period and the Renaissance, was created by the Italian humanists in their desire to form direct links with Classical Antiquity⁵. Situated between the two peaks of civilisation, the medieval transition was considered, from the 16th to the 18th century, as a period of profound and permanent cultural, intellectual and artistic decadence and as a time of interminable darkness that 16th-century humanism had finally dispelled⁶.

Better times for Medievalism came with 19th-century Romanticism. By the late-18th century, on the threshold of the French Revolution, the concept of the 'Middle Ages' had already begun to be considered by European scholars as a technical term, neutral and without negative connotations, a way of referring to a particular period. The Romantic thinkers and writers discovered the medieval period around the mid-19th century, idealising it just as the humanists had idealised Classical Antiquity. The Romantics opposed universal human reason and nature of the Enlightenment by the feeling that each moment in history is unique, unrepeatable and, therefore, worthy of study without prejudice. Historians like Augustin Thierry in his studies of the Merovingians, published in around 1840, and literati such as Victor Hugo in his *Notre-Dame de Paris*, published in 1831, enjoyed enormous success based, to a large extent, on national feeling and the taste for the exotic.

In his *History of France*, which began to be published in 1833, Jules Michelet raises this recognition to the point of paroxysm, adapting the prevailing naturalist and organicist feeling to history and considering the Middle Ages as a people's infant period. In this way, the Middle Ages becomes a key period, because on it depends the physical and moral development of the different European peoples and nations. The shared adventure of the French nation begins to be forged in the Medieval centuries, and it is here that the principal myths of French history, such as the Holy King Louis IX or Joan of Arc, take place.

Literary myths are transformed into collective images at the hand of such visionary painters as Eugène Delacroix. The mystification of the Middle Ages continued, at least until the period between the wars, when the memory of the Holy Roman-Germanic Empire was ably exploited by the Nazi regime, reinforcing the links between the different German empires, between the *Fuehrer* and the proud medieval Hohenstaufen emperors. This tendency culminated in the organisation of the National Socialist party congress in the Medieval town of Nuremberg and Ernst

⁴ Leslie J. Workman, 'Editorial', *Studies in Medievalism*, 3/1 (1987), 1. These ideas are developed in discursive form in Richard Utz, 'Speaking of Medievalism: An Interview with Leslie J. Workman', in *Medievalism in the Modern World*, ed. by Richard Utz and Tom Shippey (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 433-449.

⁵ Julia M.H. Smith, 'Introduction: Regarding Medievalists: Contexts and Approaches', in *Companion to Historiography*, ed. by Michael Bentley (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 105-107.

⁶ See Jacques Le Goff and Jean-Claude Schmitt's accurate synthesis of the vicissitudes of the concept of the Middle Ages, 'Moyen Âge', *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'Occident Médiéval*, ed. by Jacques Le Goff and Jean-Claude Schmitt (Paris: Fayard, 1999), pp.790-805, which also contains a useful biography of the question.

Kantorowicz's biography of Emperor Frederick II, who built a strongly centralised absolute state, the 'Thousand Year Reich' the Nazis prophetically announced.

From Victor Hugo to Umberto Eco, passing through the great American film blockbuster productions, the Middle Ages has always, over the last two centuries, aroused the attention of the great public. Nonetheless, from the strictly historiographical standpoint, the real change of orientation in Medievalism came about in the 1930s. It seems clear that Marc Bloch played a central role in the evolution of Medievalism over the 20th century. Bloch represents the *Nouvelle Histoire* movement better than anyone else, and his pioneering work was of a fecundity that makes it entirely valid even today. Together with the modernist Lucien Febvre, Bloch was one of the founders of the French school of the *Annales*, which had a decisive influence not only on the discipline of history but for the social sciences in general⁷. For Medievalism, the emergence of Marc Bloch signified the transition from a history centred on political and institutional phenomena to one with a marked interest in social and economic factors. Bloch's renewal was based on the conjunction of the young social sciences that had emerged from the uneasy European scientific panorama in the early-20th century: sociology, ethnology and anthropology.

Nor, however, can we ignore the important contribution made by a series of pioneering works such as those of Johan Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (1919), Marc Bloch, *Les Rois Thaumaturges* (1942) and Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (1927) all of them published after the first World War⁸. These three works combined all that is best in the European and North American tradition of Medieval Studies in the period between the wars and herald, rather prematurely, the future history of *mentalités* and the predominance of historical anthropology. They are, at the same time, the finest legacy that mid-19th-century positivist and historicist researchers could have left, as it was they who raised Medievalism to the status of a true academic discipline⁹.

The Medievalism of the 20th century: from the *Annales* to the new cultural and political history

In 1929, along with Lucien Febvre, Marc Bloch founded the *Annales* school, whose rigorous academicism aimed to rebuff the old romantic myths, the thematic polarisation of classical German historicism and the mechanicism of French positivism. New themes and methodologies appeared, based on more rigorous and systematic treatment of sources. Its main organ of expression was the journal that

⁷ Jacques Le Goff et Jean-Claude Schmitt, 'L'histoire médiévale', *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 39 (1996), 9.

⁸ Johan Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, 1999), Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957) and Marc Bloch, *Les rois thaumaturges. Étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre* (Paris: A. Colin, 1961).

⁹ Kathleen Biddick, p. 1. For this epistemological context, see *Positivismes: philosophie, sociologie, histoire, sciences*, ed. by Andrée Despy-Meyer and Didier Devriese (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999) and Georg G. Iggers, *The German Conception of History: the National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1983).

gave the school its name: *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale*¹⁰. In the 1930s, the most traditional Medievalism, that which based all activity and argumentation on theses inherited from German historicism and turn-of-the century French positivism, co-existed in Europe with the 'new history', represented by medievalists whose interests were directed almost exclusively towards the study of social and economic phenomena. The war interrupted this peculiar, impetuous renovation, dramatically taking one of its standard-bearers with it, for Marc Bloch was murdered by the Nazis because of his activities in favour of the Resistance¹¹.

After the Second World War, the Medieval Studies panorama changed radically. Enormous monographs began to be constructed based on the demographic method under the aegis of the auxiliary sciences of geography and econometrics. Medievalists' language focused on structures and forgot people. Many voluminous monographs were published in the 1950s and 60s, patiently built up over the years through systematic, quantitative analysis of vast documentary sources and generically known as the 'La terre et les hommes' cycle¹². These great historical constructions, based on structural, quantitative and serial language, broke radically with the human language developed during the period between the wars by Henri Pirenne from the economic point of view¹³, Marc Bloch from a social perspective¹⁴, François Louis Ganshof on legal aspects¹⁵, Johan Huizinga and Charles Homer Haskins from the cultural standpoint¹⁶ and Etienne Gilson from a philosophical and theological perspective¹⁷. The paradigm of the generic and the credibility of statistics had destroyed the legitimacy of studies based on singular facts.

These paradigms held absolute sway, predominating in Medievalism and social science as a whole, from the post-war years to the mid-1970s¹⁸. They were based on the naïve idea that the degree of historical objectivity was proportional to the number of documents systematically analysed. This idea began to be abandoned by the publication of a series of works that, at the risky cutting edge of innovation, dealt with singular affairs, isolated phenomena, everyday life in small villages. The enormous success in terms of sales enjoyed by Georges Duby's *Bouvines* and Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie's *Montaillou*, published in 1973 and 1975 respectively, gave serious warning of the exhaustion the structural, quantitative and serial model had reached¹⁹.

Things would never again be the same in the field of Medievalism after the mid-1970s. This was because, firstly, the connections between all the social sciences had

¹⁰ An excellent synthesis of the evolution of the historic *Annales* school and the changing evolution of the review itself, in Peter Burke, *The French historical revolution. The Annales school, 1929-89* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990).

¹¹ See his biography, Olivier Dumoulin, *Marc Bloch* (Paris: Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, 2000).

¹² Thomas Bisson, 'La terre et les hommes: a programme fulfilled?', *French History*, 14 (2000), 322-345.

¹³ Henri Pirenne, *Histoire économique et sociale du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969).

¹⁴ Marc Bloch, *La société féodale* (Paris: A. Michel, 1940).

¹⁵ François Louis Ganshof, *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité?* (Bruxelles: Office de Publicité, 1944).

¹⁶ Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927).

¹⁷ Étienne Gilson, *L'esprit de la philosophie médiévale* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1932).

¹⁸ For this historiographic context, a useful study is that by Lawrence Stone, 'The revival of narrative: reflections on a new old history', *Past and Present. A Journal of Historical Studies*, 85 (1979).

¹⁹ Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou, village occitan de 1294 à 1324* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975); Georges Duby, *Le Dimanche de Bouvines, 27 juillet 1214* (Paris: Gallimard, 1973).

multiplied. Anthropology and linguistics took a leading role, methodologically and epistemologically fuelling the work of the new Medievalists. These were the catalysts of the cultural and linguistic turn that affected the entire social science field at that time. Anthropology was the principal methodological reference for a current that was to have enormous influence on Medievalism in the 1980s: the history of mentalities. In Medievalism, the principal exponents of this were Georges Duby and Jacques Le Goff. The themes became greatly expanded. The everyday, the singular, social practices, gender, representations, codes, minorities, discourses, images, myths and spirituality came to the fore, whilst price curves, determinist geographical studies and macroeconomic studies of medieval societies fell into disuse. Violence was studied in its cultural manifestations, not as a mechanical cause of class struggle. The weight of symbolic capital appears more important to medievalists than material capital.

In the 1970s, similarly to what had occurred in the early-20th century, when relations between sociologists, geographers, anthropologists and art, theology and law historians were encouraged, a fresh encounter took place amongst the different social sciences. Benefiting from the linguistic turn throughout the social sciences, linguists were now added to the list of specialists. Though it has now fallen into disuse, the concept of *mentalités*—always in plural, as is said in the contribution of Jean Claude Schmitt about Jacques Le Goff—enabled many of these pluridisciplinary efforts to be agglutinated in the field of Medievalism. This greatly enriched the medievalist's methodology with the availability of new themes and, therefore, the possibility of rediscovering new sources or of reading these from different perspectives from what had been usual in these years. Studying parentage, the function of gifts, myths, attitudes towards death, infancy, feelings, fear, was no longer a marginal activity, but became central to Medieval Studies.

The economy was no longer the key subject, leaving the field free for a new, open and pluridisciplinary concept of culture. As an alternative to the determinisms structuralism, quantitative history and marxism, the new currents emerging in the 1970s proposed a many-sided approach to reality based on the broadest concept of culture. In the 1980s, the American historian Michael Kammen suggested that a notion of culture should be adopted in its most anthropological conception, to serve as a base for reintegrating the different approaches to reality in the past²⁰. The result was a new cultural history whose origins could be traced back to the 1920s, in monographs such as Johan Huizinga's work on the autumn of the Middle Ages or Marc Bloch's study of the magic making kings. This was, however, a cultural history based on very different methodological parameters from those used by the Medievalists between the wars. In 1989, Lynn Hunt directed a volume on the latest historiographical tendencies, giving it the significant title of *The New Cultural History*²¹. The new current was thus defined, and began to dominate the historiographical panorama of the 1980s, particularly in the Anglo-American academic field.

The roots of this new cultural history go back to the old search for a methodology to replace the reduction of history to political or diplomatic phenomena. The

²⁰ Michael Kammen, 'Extending the Reach of American Cultural History', *American Studies*, 29 (1984), 19-42.

²¹ *The New Cultural History*, ed. By Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

Annales had done this through social and, in a second period, determinist-demographic history; marxism, through economic history. The new movements attempted to do this through a renewed, multidisciplinary concept of culture, reviving and renewing the old theses discussed in the pioneering studies of Jacob Burckhardt (1818-1897) and Johan Huizinga (1872-1945), for whom the principal objective of the social sciences was knowledge of the culture. The new cultural history became consolidated through a complex process of epistemological selection after passing the history of mentalities phase, rejecting the proposals based on the most radical literary theory and appropriating Clifford Geertz's ideas and modern anthropology as their closest intellectual points of reference²².

The 1950s and 60s had been dominated by economic and demographic history, with the application of quantitative methods. The 1970s had seen attempts to revive historical narrative and the predominance of social history over economic history. Now, in the 80s and 90s, cultural history – in the broadest sense and without abandoning the field of social history – appears to be the field most cultivated by medievalists²³.

As usually occurs with these broad-ranging intellectual and historiographical currents, very different tendencies converge in the new cultural history. Firstly, the historians of the 1980s assimilated the postulates of the linguistic turn and other, more extreme tendencies such as post-structuralism and deconstructionism, leaving their more radical aspects to one side. Secondly, these historians continued to trust in the positive effects of the interdisciplinary approach, benefiting from the proposals of philosophers like Michel Foucault, anthropologists like Clifford Geertz, popular culture historians like Peter Burke, narrativists like Natalie Z. Davis, micro-historians like Carlo Ginzburg, historians of mentalities like Georges Duby, exponents of the materialist tradition like Edward Thompson and historiographers like Hayden White and Dominick LaCapra.

The new cultural history attempts to build an integrated narrative of all cultural manifestations. For this reason, other disciplines such as art history, intellectual history or literary history fit perfectly into this new current. At the same time, the individual is the main reference point in the new cultural history in a reaction against a history of mentalities that the new medievalists criticise for its tendency to deify cultural phenomena. The new cultural history has no fear of the isolated, singular phenomenon – something historians of mentalities had always mistrusted – and in this a more profound influx of the postulates of the new narrative history and microhistory can be appreciated.

The energy of this new current has led some historians to speak of the triumph of the cultural turn over the linguistic turn in the 1980s and 90s. According to this view, the currents derived from the 1970s cultural turn became more widely inserted and disseminated in the discipline of history than those that emerged from the linguistic turn²⁴. The new cultural history emerged from the wreck of serial and

²² See the Introduction to the work mentioned, *The New Cultural History*, pp.1-22.

²³ See ideas on this respect in the Introduction to the volume *La 'nueva' historia cultural: la influencia del postestructuralismo y el auge de la interdisciplinariedad*, ed. by Ignacio Olábarri and Francisco J. Caspistegui (Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1996), pp. 9-11.

²⁴ The thesis of the 'cultural turn' is defended by Donald R. Kelley, 'El giro cultural en la investigación histórica', in *La 'nueva' historia cultural*, pp. 35-48.

Marxist history, which had attempted to locate the hidden mechanisms in the historic change under the surface of collective behaviour²⁵. The new currents were not only opposed to these paths extrinsically – through a mutation in themes – but also intrinsically, containing as they did a powerful and effective phenomenological critique of paradigm methods. Study of consumption now predominated over production, external manifestations of culture over the hidden geographic and economic structures.

The new cultural history rejects the reductionism of classical historicism and economic history, eschews the dream of objectivity, recognises the basic role of the imagination in historic reconstruction and, abandoning outmoded naively totalising aspirations, opts for the middle way of interpretive social science, as diagnosed and postulated by Clifford Geertz and Charles Taylor²⁶. Comprehension predominates over explanation, and hermeneutics over causal analysis in access to knowledge about the past. However, the new cultural history also appears to have aspirations to total history, as could not be otherwise in a current that seeks to be hegemonic²⁷. The cultural focus gives the historian a multiplicity of viewpoints that increase his or her credibility, though in this strength may also lie weakness.

In such a context, it is logical, too, that political history should have been reactivated with such strength. Based on such magnificent precedents as *The King's Two Bodies* (1957) by the German historian Ernst Kantorowicz or the British Walter Ullmann's *Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages* (1966), medievalists have found rich terrain here, to such an extent that recent years have seen talk of the creation of a real new political history. The new political history focuses on a wide diversity of subjects²⁸. The interest generated in such themes as national identity²⁹ or political mythography³⁰ is evident. Clear, too, is the phenomenon of the rehabilitation of biography as a true historic genre, considered now as one of the best methods for demonstrating the connections between past and present, memory and project, individual and society³¹. Biography, long rejected by the historiographic avant-garde, was restored under the influence of anthropology and psychology in the case of individual biographies, psychology and sociology in the case of collective biography³². These genres were also joined by such completely new fields as exercises in ego-history or autobiographical accounts of intellectual careers or

²⁵ *Para comprender el cambio social. Enfoques teóricos y perspectivas historiográficas*, ed. by Valentín Vázquez de Prada et al. (Pamplona: Eunsa, 1997).

²⁶ Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Culture. Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), and Charles Taylor, 'Interpretation and the Sciences of Man', *Philosophy and the Human Sciences, Philosophical Papers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), II, pp. 15-57.

²⁷ This is the thesis defended by Peter Burke, 'Historia cultural e historia total', in *La 'nueva' historia cultural*, pp. 115-122.

²⁸ Some of them are reflected in the joint volume, *Pour une histoire politique*, ed. by René Rémond (Paris: Seuil, 1988). See also, Jacques Le Goff, '¿Es la política todavía el esqueleto de la historia?', in *Lo maravilloso y lo cotidiano en el Occidente Medieval* (Barcelona: Gedisa, 1994), pp. 163-178.

²⁹ *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

³⁰ It is in this context, for example, that we must note the influence of the Rumanian intellectual Mircea Eliade's suggestive work in historiography: *Myths and symbols. Studies in honor of Mircea Eliade*, ed. by Josep M. Kitagawa and Charles H. Long (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

³¹ Philippe Levillain, 'Les protagonistes de la biographie', in *Pour une histoire politique*, p. 158.

³² Ignacio Olábarri, 'La resurrección de Mnemósine', in *La 'nueva' historia cultural*, pp. 145-174.

lives³³. More important than the life of the subject him or herself is its relation to the context, and the revival of the biography is made clear by Jacques Le Goff's two most recent published works, on Saint Louis and Saint Francis of Assisi³⁴, taking his example, perhaps from the magnificent precedent set by Georges Duby in his biography of 'le meilleur chevalier du monde'³⁵.

The rebirth of political subjects also took the form of interest in the ethics of power, the social elites, patronage, the way government is structured, access to political power, relations between matrimonial politics and power, the exercise of government, political thought, and voter conduct and motivation³⁶. Along with these new themes are added others already established during the 1970s. Jürgen Habermas' concept of the public sphere or space plays an important role here, as it introduces a new reflection on the true political arena, the relations between the public and the private and the possibility of analysing it without recourse to the mediating realities of institutions, organisations or the State³⁷.

The different forms of political renovation have had a notable influence on Medievalism, where new light is thrown on the question of devolution and the distribution of authority and power in a human group thanks to a pluridisciplinary approach³⁸. It is no longer a question merely of describing behaviour, but of analysing perceptions, sensitivities, centres of creation of authority, phenomena involving the transmission of beliefs, norms and values, the forms of representation of power. This range of subjects contributes, paradoxically, to depoliticising political history, subjecting the political sphere to the cultural universe³⁹. This depoliticisation of political history leads to the paradox, so symptomatic of present historiographic circumstances, that we cannot talk, strictly speaking, of a new political history. In its desire to integrate, the new political history has become a conglomerate of social, economic and, above all, cultural history. This is what leads one to consider the ever-greater weight wielded by the so-called new cultural history.

All this also helped to revive the religious and legal history of the Middle Ages. Gabriel Le Bras effectively promoted the renovation of religious sociology, insisting on the revival of such cultural manifestations as canon law or the liturgy for a better understanding of Medieval culture. Eric Palazzo's work on the sociological dimension of the liturgy provides excellent examples of the usefulness and efficacy of these methodologies⁴⁰. In this way, a truly interdisciplinary dialogue is set up between the different social sciences and theology. Medieval Roman and canon law are not considered a mere revival of classical Roman law, but in their more original dimension, as a medieval creation.

³³ Georges Duby, 'Le plaisir de l'historien', in *Essais d'égohistoire*, ed. by Pierre Nora (Paris: Gallimard, 1987), pp. 109-138.

³⁴ Jacques Le Goff, *Saint Louis* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996) and Jacques Le Goff, *Saint François d'Assise* (Paris: Gallimard, 1999).

³⁵ Georges Duby, *Guillaume Le Maréchal ou le meilleur chevalier du monde* (Paris: Fayard, 1984).

³⁶ Philippe R. Vandermeer, 'The New Political History: Progress and Prospects', in *International Handbook of Historical Studies. Contemporary Research and Theory*, ed. by Georg G. Iggers and Harold T. Parker (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979), pp. 87-108.

³⁷ *Habermas and Modernity*, ed. by Richard J. Bernstein (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988).

³⁸ Martin Aurell, *L'empire des Plantagenêt: 1154-1224* (Paris: Perrin, 2003).

³⁹ Christophe Prochasson, 'Vingt ans d'histoire politique en France', in *Historia a Debate*, ed. by Carlos Barros, 3 vols. (Coruña: Historia a Debate, 2000), III, p. 212 and p. 215.

⁴⁰ Eric Palazzo, *Liturgie et société au Moyen Âge* (Paris: Aubier, 2000).

All these historiographical paradigms paved the way for rupture with the rigid disciplinary systems that had dominated Medievalism up to the 1970s. Now, transversal relations predominate over vertical. The different social science disciplines have converged to a large extent, and pluridisciplinary conferences have become frequent such as this one at the University of Navarre – on which this volume is based – or the recent one held at the University of Illinois-Urbana ('The State of Medieval Studies', October 2003). Based on the distant precedents of the works of Etienne Gilson and Marie-Dominique Chenu and, nearer to hand, Georges Duby and Jacques Le Goff, intellectual history has agglutinated the histories of theology, philosophy, literature and political ideas. Semiotic studies have been applied, conferring a modern aura on certain approaches to medieval linguistics and grammar, as can be appreciated in the works of Umberto Eco, Julia Kristeva and Hubert Damisch, amongst others. The recuperation of Erwin Panofski and Georges Duby's brilliant works have helped to relate aesthetics to scholastic art. No one can continue to label the Middle Ages an obscurantist period⁴¹.

The present situation: from post-modernism to the new Medievalism

With modernism, Medievalism is the field that has shown the greatest methodological and epistemological vitality during the 20th century. Medievalists like Johan Huizinga, Charles H. Haskins, Marc Bloch, Georges Duby and Jacques Le Goff have contributed decisively to renewing the methodological tools that all intellectuals use to construct texts, whatever field they come from. It is true that, nowadays, the centre of gravity of the cutting-edge innovation appears to have moved to modernism, where the new narrativists have found rich, fertile ground for their markedly pluridisciplinary experimentation. Here we can mention particularly Carlo Ginzburg, Natalie Z. Davis and Simon Schama. Nonetheless, for much of the 20th century Medievalism was the reference point for social scientists seeking to renew their methodological arsenal.

Nowadays, however, Medievalism appears to have greater reserves regarding the viability of post-modernism as a source of methodological progress⁴². Several reasons may contribute to this epistemological prudence, including medievalists' tendency to advance prudently in their researches, never straying far from their sources⁴³. Nonetheless, the effects of the so-called linguistic turn have gradually spread through Medievalism. The principle result in the field of research is the gradual transformation of our comprehension of documentation, conceived more as a text than as a source⁴⁴. The traditional idea of history is being gradually trans-

⁴¹ Jacques Le Goff and Jean-Claude Schmitt, 'L'histoire médiévale', *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 39 (1996), 21.

⁴² The term 'post-modernism' was made popular by the publication of Jean-François Lyotard, *La condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir* (Paris: Minuit 1979), though it was not assimilated by Anglo-Saxon academia until the mid-1980s, when Lyotard's work was translated. Regarding its impact on Medievalism, see William D. Paden, 'Scholars at a Perilous Ford', *The Future of the Middle Ages: Medieval Literature in the 1990s*, ed. by William D. Paden (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994).

⁴³ Paul Freedman and Gabrielle M. Spiegel, 'Medievalisms Old and New: The Rediscovery of Alterity in North American Medieval Studies', *American Historical Review*, 103 (1998), 694.

⁴⁴ Gabrielle M. Spiegel, 'Introduction', *The Past as Text. Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

formed from a narrative to a representation⁴⁵. This increases the feeling that access to the past is not direct, as it occurs through the mediation of texts and icons.

In short, what the medievalist recovers is not strictly the past, but the images the past produces of itself, the 'footprints' of the past⁴⁶. This was something Georges Duby had already expressed in 1973, not theorising but writing history. Through Duby's multifaceted vision of the Battle of Bouvines, he achieved both a historic and a historiographic study. On one level, he used contemporary sources on the battle to illustrate medieval attitudes to war and social values in general. But, at the same time, on a double level of interpretation, Duby masterfully analyses visions after the battle as the footprints that generate myths and that, in turn, reveal more about the context of the narrators than about the event they narrated⁴⁷.

All these new methodologies are based on treating documents more as texts than as sources, causing the opacity and instability of historical knowledge to increase considerably. This generates a series of highly understandable doubts amongst medievalists, who see their scientific legitimacy come under attack, their very foundations shaken, the efficacy of the new palaeographic, diplomatic, epigraphic, iconological and codicological techniques undermined. The new Medievalism becomes a science, not of facts, but of discourses or, at best, of the codification of facts⁴⁸.

For the new tendencies, the text contains multiple meanings that require study from a many-sided and, therefore, pluridisciplinary perspective. This perspective has considerably reduced the disciplinary distances between philologists and historians in the field of Medievalism, such that experts from both fields participate without distinction in many collective volumes published in recent years. The hypothesis has even been put forward that the post-modern text has become *medievalised*, since writing has lost the authority and univocity it had acquired both in Classical Antiquity (*quod scripsi, scripsi*) and in the Renaissance, whose philologists had sought to objectify the historic text through the critical method. The pre-modern (Medieval) and post-modern text converge, as they radically contrast with the modern text, whose univocity was based on an empirical, scientific, positivist and paradigmatic reading of reality that reaches us through texts⁴⁹.

In brief, these theses, somewhat radical at first sight, lead us to consider the long modern period as a 'new Middle Ages', located between the pre-modern age (the period we have known until now as the 'Middle Ages') and *fin de siècle* post-modernism. In this view, the Medieval period is no longer an intermediate period, a *media aetas* between Classical Antiquity and the Renaissance, but a space with its own personality. What now becomes the object of doubt is the whole modern period, which is considered just as an intermediate period between the pre-modern and the post-modern. Ironically, modernity becomes a small alteration, an interruption in

⁴⁵ Rogier Chartier, 'Le monde comme représentation', *Annales E.S.C.*, 44 (1989), 1505-1520.

⁴⁶ On the concept of 'historical footprints', see François Dosse's magnificent essay, *Història. Entre la ciència i el relat* (València: Universitat de València, 2001).

⁴⁷ Georges Duby, *Le Dimanche de Bouvines*.

⁴⁸ Eugène Vance, 'Semiotics and Power: Relics, Icons and the *Voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople*', in *The New Medievalism*, ed. by Marina S. Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), p. 227.

⁴⁹ Ideas discussed by David Greetham, 'Romancing the Text, Medievalizing the Book', in *Medievalism in the Modern World*, p. 409. See also Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992).

the connection between the pre-modern and the post-modern, between Medieval culture and contemporary culture⁵⁰.

The idea of a reintegration between medieval culture and post-modern culture may appear excessively theoretic, rhetorical or demagogical. But philosophers are well aware of the influx of certain theories in recent years whose parallelisms with the debates the medieval period was concerned with are evident. Contemporary semiotic theory is based to a large extent on – or at least, bears notable analogy with – the distinction between *signum* and *res* so closely identified with medieval hermeneutics. The post-structuralist wordplay of Foucault and Derrida is something more than echoes of the rhetorical debates between nominalists and universalists that such medieval philosophers as Pedro Abelardo and William de Champeaux engaged in⁵¹.

Paradoxically, Medievalism regains all its energy and personality in the new historiographic tendencies. Some even go so far as to talk of a *new Middle Ages*, identified with post-modernity, different both from the medieval historical period and from the different historic reconstructions known as *medievalisms* (the Gothic, the Romantic, the Victorian, the Positivism, the Historicism)⁵². Such has been the post-modern reaction against the values of modernity that it has taken medieval values as its own: the desire to see oneself in the mirror of the Middle Ages has been so vehement that the image reflected back has become an intellectual reality.

These new currents are not accepted, however, by most medievalists active today. Many prefer to stay on the margin of historiographic debates that appear to them excessively theoretic and undermine the scientific seriousness traditionally attributed to Medievalism. The rest, attempting simply to employ common sense in their research, show an understandable reserve towards the invasion of Medievalism by post-modern ideas, because, taken to their ultimate consequences, they generate a relativism in no way appropriate for scientific work. Some academics are left perplexed by the affirmations of certain principal exponents of the new currents, such as that put forward by Hayden V. White in 1978: 'There has been a reluctance to consider historical narratives as what they manifestly are: verbal fictions, the contents of which are as much invented as found and the forms of which have more in common with their counterparts in literature than they have with those in the sciences'⁵³.

Nonetheless, we can well mention, too, some of the more positive results of these new tendencies. These beneficial effects are those that explain why some prestigious medievalists, particularly in North America, have decided to adopt some of the new approaches in their scientific work. Perhaps the most important is the considerable increase in the interdisciplinary dialogue that Medievalism has seen over the last 20 years. An excellent example of the new currents' capacity to create common spaces in the social sciences is found in the wealth and variety of approaches

⁵⁰ Stephen G. Nichols, 'The New Medievalism: Tradition and Discontinuity in Medieval Culture', in *The New Medievalism*, pp. 8-9 and Stephen Toulmin, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity* (New York: Free Press, 1990), p. 3.

⁵¹ Along the lines of Umberto Eco's essay, 'The Return to the Middle Ages', *Travels in Hyper reality* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986).

⁵² David Greetham, 'Romancing the Text, Medievalizing the Book', in *Medievalism in the Modern World*, p. 424.

⁵³ Hayden V. White, *Tropics of discourse. Essays in cultural criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), p. 82.

in collaborations brought together in the collective work *The New Medievalism*, published in 1991⁵⁴.

The 'New Medievalism' has been defined as the application of literary and cultural theories associated to such radical anthropologists and philosophers as Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida. All these thinkers are considered to be in the post-modernist orbit, and it is therefore no surprise that many have identified the new Medievalism with the new intellectual currents that distinguish themselves from modernity in a definitive rupture that some have considered the 'long Renaissance'⁵⁵. Post-modernism abandons the single thought of modernity and progress and considers history from a many-sided point of view, with the intention of freeing it from traditional academic methodological moulds.

The most complex thing about this movement is, probably the difficulty of fixing it methodologically and epistemologically. Nonetheless, its existence is recognised and mistrusted by academics and even such authorised observers as Lawrence Stone, who have seen it as a real threat to the very survival of the social sciences⁵⁶. More than an intellectual current proper, post-modernism is a collection of epistemologies and methodologies. Outstanding amongst these converging tendencies are Foucaultian post-structuralism and Derridean deconstructionism, the new hermeneutics of Paul Ricoeur and Michel de Certeau and those deriving from the linguistic turn. All these have strongly influenced how we conceive and write history⁵⁷.

All these currents have led Medievalists to reconsider to a large extent the realities that appeared most firmly established within the discipline. Some have decried the reduction of the academic discipline that is Medievalism to assimilating a series of techniques, such as diplomacy, palaeography or text edition, and that ensure appropriate procedures but do not guarantee access to the reality of the past. For this reason, they argue that sources should be treated as texts, as documents, with all the interpretive repercussions this entails. Texts, unlike documents, contain an ideology, an intentionality, they reflect a reading of the world in themselves, and they require in themselves an interpretation that puts them in contact with their context.

Moderate positions also abound amongst these new currents, however. Many moderate critics realise that their work should be based on appropriate, systematic and rigorous treatment of documentation⁵⁸. Others are less cautious, explicitly making clear that, though they admire and respect their legacy, they do not share the philosophy of the founders of the discipline. Their intention in this is to purify and revitalise Medievalism, breaking with tradition and strengthening the discipline's internal and external frontiers⁵⁹. Finally, some suggest a subtle distinction between Medieval Studies, whose object is the scientific study of the Middle Ages,

⁵⁴ *The New Medievalism* ed. by Marina S. Brownlee and others.

⁵⁵ William D. Paden, 'New Medievalism and Medievalism', *The Year's Work in Medievalism*, 10 (1995), 232-233.

⁵⁶ Lawrence Stone, 'History and post-modernism', *Past and Present*, 131 (1991).

⁵⁷ See some of these manifestations in Peter Barry, *Beginning theory. An introduction to literary and cultural theory* (Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, 1995).

⁵⁸ Lee Patterson, 'The Return of Philology', in *The Past and Future of Medieval Studies*, ed. by John Van Engen (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), p. 241.

⁵⁹ 'We are not he (in reference to one of the founders of the discipline, Abbot Migne), nor do we and the volume's contributors share the philosophy of the founders of the discipline, as much as we admire and respect their legacy', from the Editor's Introduction, in *Medievalism and the Modernist Temper*, ed. by R. Howard Bloch & Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), p. 21).

and Medievalism, which represents the application of ideas about the medieval period to their respective contemporary situations⁶⁰. We can, therefore, speak of univocal Medieval Studies and of multifaceted Medievalisms like of Romanic, Victorian, positivist, Marxist or post-modern Medievalism, a situation that, in turn, justifies current talk of a new Medievalism as opposed to the old Medievalism⁶¹.

In any case, all these conflicting ideas make it clear that there is at present a debate between the old Medievalism, imbued with the traditional values inherited from the positivist scientific method and classical historicism, and the new Medievalism, which supports the idea of a presentist approach to the Medieval reality by applying methods concomitant to post-modern currents. This conflict between old and new Medievalism has led some to suggest that the discipline is in a state of shock at present⁶². This appears to me an excessively catastrophic diagnosis, as the medievalists I know are still peaceably seated at their desks before their patient investigations, far from the epistemological trauma some would have us believe looms.

Nonetheless, at the risk of appearing to contradict myself, and with all the prudence we should bring to bear with regard to the postulates of the new Medievalism, I feel it is appropriate that this introduction should mention the magnificent theoretical studies that have been published over the last decade and which can make such an important contribution to improving the Medievalist's pluridisciplinary formation. The ideas expressed in the titles of these works ('The New Medievalism', 'The Shock of Medievalism', 'Negotiating the Past', 'The Past as Text') may appear over-pretentious, but they do represent the moderate balance between theory and practice, between access to primary sources and knowledge of the interpretive bibliography that all Medievalists should cultivate⁶³.

This balance between theory and practice will contribute to a gradual rapprochement between Medieval Studies and Medievalism. Medieval Studies will be enriched by the greater mastery of theoretical approaches inherent in Medievalism, whilst Medievalism will apply the historicism of Medieval Studies more rigorously. I hope that this book, deeply rooted in Medievalism but at the same time closely linked to the field of Medieval Studies, will represent a step forward in this direction.

⁶⁰ Leslie Workman, 'Editorial', *Studies in Medievalism*, 3/1 (1987), 1. The same author later revised his views, moving towards a more integrating vision of the concepts of 'Medieval studies' and 'Medievalism', influenced to a large extent by the more continuist approaches described in Norman F. Cantor's controversial book, *Inventing the Middle Ages. The lives, works, and ideas of the great Medievalists of the twentieth century* (New York: Morrow, 1991).

⁶¹ Richard Utz and Tom Shippey, 'Medievalism in the Modern World: Introductory Perspectives', in *Medievalism in the Modern World*, p. 5.

⁶² Kathleen Biddick, p. 2.

⁶³ Some of this works have already been quoted in this article: *The New Medievalism*; *The Shock of Medievalism*; *Medievalism in the Modern World*; *The Past and the Future of Medieval Studies* and *Medievalism and the Modernist Temper*. The others are: Lee Patterson, *Negotiating the Past: The Historical Understanding of Medieval Literature* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), *Medievalism in England*, ed. by Leslie J. Workman (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1992) and *Medievalism in England II*, ed. by Leslie J. Workman and Kathleen Verduin (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1996).

Frederic William Maitland (1850 – 1906)

Natalie FRYDE
(University of Darmstadt)

Frederick William Maitland is still regarded as the greatest British medieval historian ever. The man was so many-sided and subtle with, as his most recent biographer G. R. Elton said, “a real touch of genius” that one can always find something new to say about him¹. Maitland was born in 1850 and died -relatively young, a possible victim of the killer-disease of the day, tuberculosis- in 1906. He was both popular and famous in his life- time and has remained a legend right down until today. Apparently, in the common rooms of his old College, Downing, in Cambridge he still enjoys cult status. A couple of years ago a plaque was erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey, a privilege which few historians have enjoyed and which he rightfully deserved.

A failed lawyer, a bad lecturer, a tetchy letter writer, he was a good friend, a thoroughly charming and learned Victorian gentleman. His reputation, however, ultimately hangs on his written work, in particular his *History of English Law*, published in 1895, of which he wrote 99% and, his friend and colleague Sir Frederick Pollock a mere 1% although it appeared under their joint names². I shall start by indicating his uniqueness as a legal historian, both in comparison with his forerunners and his successors. As my second point I shall show how he provided another view of the Middle Ages from the Constitutional historians who constituted mainstream medievalism in his time. Thirdly I shall try to place him in the context of the place he takes in the development of medieval history as a profession. And finally and briefly as a product of learned society at the end of the nineteenth century³.

* * *

It is most important to begin by saying that although one could in Maitland's time study history, just about, he did not do so. He studied moral science at Cambridge, trained subsequently as a lawyer and practised in this profession before, apparently, either getting bored with it or seeing that he could not make a living out of it. He was author of a number of articles on purely legal questions, for example on land law reform before he turned to history. It was the preparation and

¹ Geoffrey R. Elton, *F. W. Maitland* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985) p.vii. The word genius also falls by Herbert Albert Laurens Fisher, *Frederick William Maitland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), p. 22; Henry E. Bell, *Maitland. A Critical Examination and Assessment* (London: 1965), p. 2.

² Pollock was quite fair about this privately, Henry Arthur Holland, *Frederick William Maitland. A Memorial Address* (Selden Society Annual Lecture) (London: 1953), p. 13. Bell, 62.

³ The best brief introductions to him are the entry in the supplementary volume to the *Dictionary of National Biography 1901-1911* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920), pp. 552-55; Robert L. Schuyler, *Frederic William Maitland, Historian* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960). The most recent work is *The History of English Law: Centenary Essays on Pollock and Maitland (Proceedings of the British Academy)*, ed. by John Hudson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

research for his work on land law that he became interested in the past and the inspiration of the distinguished lawyer Sir Frederick Pollock, a few years his senior and whom he no doubt knew from Eton, which drew him into the study of the history of English law⁴.

In his introduction to the *History of English Law*, he praised his predecessors, in particular William Blackstone, whose works are synonymous even today for legal text books. This is characteristic of Maitland that in his publications he only praises but this is misleading. His aims and attitude to the history of English law were the antithesis of those of Blackstone. As he expressed it in the introduction to the *History* "It has been usual for writers commencing the exposition of any particular system of law to undertake, to a greater or less extent, philosophical discussion of the nature of laws in general and definition of the most general notions of jurisprudence. We purposely refrain from any such undertaking. The philosophical analysis and definition of law belongs, in our judgement, neither to the historical nor to the dogmatic science of law. The matter of legal science is not an ideal result of ethical or political analysis; it is the actual results of facts of human nature and history. Common knowledge assures us that in every tolerably settled community there are rules by which men are expected to order their conduct. Some of these rules are not expressed in any authentic form, nor declared with authority by any person or body distinct from the community at large, not enforced by any power constituted for that purpose. Others are declared by some person or body having permanently, or for the time being, public authority for that purpose and when so declared are conceived as binding the members of the community in a special manner"⁵.

Let us compare this with the introduction to Blackstone: "When the supreme being formed the universe and created matter out of nothing, he impressed certain principles upon that matter" which Blackstone defines as laws⁶. This then is the general significance of law, a rule of action dictated by some superior being. Blackstone's introduction develops into a very theocratic conception of law, not so very different from that of the medieval lawyers themselves. It is a very strong trait in English law inherited from Sir Francis Bacon which Maitland helped to eliminate. Maitland's concept is in contrast very human and very modern, even for our day. As a former scholar of moral science and pupil of the philosopher Sir Henry Sidgwick, this stance is unexpected but he was a man who took a long time to find himself and anything he had to do on the way, he did well. As an agnostic, a liberal and a realist Maitland means a revolution in the secularisation and demythologising of English law.

* * *

In a second and also very important respect Maitland departed from the English legal tradition, he abandoned antiquarianism⁷. He was neither interested in the

⁴ Schuyler, 5.

⁵ Frederick Pollock and Frederick William Maitland, *History of English Law*, 2 vols. (HEL) second edn., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, repr. 1898), vol. I, p. xxiv.

⁶ William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England in four books* (London: Printed by A. Strahan, law-printer to the king for T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1809), p. 3.

⁷ For these antiquarian studies, Philippa Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional. Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

offices of government nor of the law for their own sake nor the development and process of law in a vacuum but with in its interaction with the population. In this he broke with the long tradition founded by Sir John Coke –of whom he was very critical⁸– of John Selden, William Prynne etc. Their reverence of the law as it was and its unique development had played an important part in the political thinking of the seventeenth century where the law was regarded, with the Church off England and the Monarchy as one of the buttresses against the constant threat of the fiendish Catholic continent with its rigid Roman Law.

Maitland is an exceptional figure in that he deliberately disassociated himself from all but University politics although remarks in his letters and information of friends confirm that he was a liberal and not a conservative historian. This is all the more surprising since the English Common Law remained a useful political instrument to further nationalism in Maitland's time. Maitland recognised this: "anti-quarian research appears for a while as the guardian and renovator of national liberties and the men who lead the House of Commons are becoming always more deeply versed in long forgotten records"⁹. Maitland, although fanatically interested in his subject, never succumbed to any sort of mythology, let alone its exploitation for patriotic reasons as was the order of the day. His law remains a fascinating study of the human situation in a particular setting. Quite apart that from the fact that he was a brilliant stylist, this is what makes his work so readable and was also very witty which is most unusual for a medieval historian.

His ability to throw off this antiquarianism is even more amazing since he was a scholar who worked primarily from original records. People like Blackstone consulted legal collections, books of statutes but Maitland actually dirtied his hands with the Year Books, Common Pleas Rolls, with even dirtier Manorial records quite apart from more compact texts like Domesday Book or Bracton's Notebook. English law, say the lawyers, is case law and Maitland studied cases and he had an unerring eye for typical cases which reflected legal developments and untypical ones which forged the development of English law. This is why the edition of the Year Books was so important to him since they are fascinating discussion of cases which show you how the minds of the judges were working and reveal fascinating insights into everyday life as well¹⁰.

He also didn't believe you could understand the 'old law' except by means of examples and maintained that he could not do so himself – he needed to personalise things. This ability to do so at a high intellectual level characterised his work. His former partner Pollock put it in a nutshell: "It is not easy to convey an adequate notion of Maitland's work to those who have not themselves laboured in the field. It is still less easy for any one to appreciate the difficulties or the success who does not remember the conditions under which he started [...] Looking back some twenty-five years, we see the early history of the Common Law still obscure, insulated, a seeming chaos of technical antiquities. Historians excusably shrank from it, and

⁸ HEL, II, 552, 563, 587.

⁹ Otto Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Ages Translated and with an introduction by F. W. Maitland* (reprint of the 1900 edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). Maitland mentions his indebtedness to Gierke in the introduction to *Township and Borough* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898), p. xiv.

¹⁰ *Year Books of Edward II* (Publications of Selden Society) (1899): vol. I, 1307; vol. XVII, 1; vol. II, 1308-1309-1310; (1903): vol. XIX; (1904): vol. III, 1309-1310, (1905), vol. XX.

the lawyers who really knew much of it could almost be counted on one's fingers... This was the world which Maitland's genius transformed... So complete has the transformation been that our children will hardly believe how uncritical their grandfathers were, and on what palpable fictions they were nourished... Maitland commanded the dry bones to live and henceforth they are alive"¹¹. Unfortunately since his time, the study of English law has largely reverted to intelligent antiquarianism, is primarily written by historians and ignored by lawyers. Although he would have been pleased with the editions of documents produced by his Selden Society, I don't think he would have been happy with many of the introductions to this series.

* * *

In a third respect Maitland seems very modern: he not only stepped out of the framework of the legal historians but also of the constitutional historians who dominated historical studies in his time¹². Again, he did it very nicely: His paragraph on English Constitutional history is very wry, perhaps even sarcastic: "We have left to Constitutional History the field that she has appropriated"¹³. The touch of illegality in the word "appropriation" is typical Maitland! He names as his grounds, not wishing to repeat what the most important member of this school, Bishop William Stubbs, whom he praises loudly elsewhere, "has admirably said" but then takes a straightforward swipe at the constitutional historians "Besides for a long time past, ever since the days of Selden and Prynne, many Englishmen have been keenly interested in the history of parliament and of taxation and of all that directly concerns the government of the realm. If we could persuade a few of them to take a similar interest in the history of ownership, possession, contract, agency, trust, legal proof and so forth... she should have achieved an unlooked for success"¹⁴. Maitland genuinely but not uncritically admired Stubbs¹⁵. but it is quite clear that Maitland who pleaded for "an artistically balanced picture of English medieval law"¹⁶ regarded constitutional history as occupying too central a role. He was right but it still took many generations to remove it from its pedestal and we still live in its shadow. Maitland and Stubbs shared the belief in the Germanic origins of English law and institutions which may have mitigated the irritation between them but it would be very interesting to know what Bishop Stubbs thought of Maitland. One can so well

¹¹ From Sir Frederick Pollock's obituary of Maitland cit. in R. L. Schuyler, 'The Historical Spirit Incarnate', *American Historical Review*, 57 (1952), 303-322 (p. 322).

¹² *William Stubbs on the English Constitution*, ed. by Norman Cantor (New York: Crowell, 1966), pp. 9-10. See by the same author, *Inventing the Middle Ages. The Lives, Works and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century* (New York: W. Morrow, 1991), pp. 48-66.

¹³ HEL, I, 36.

¹⁴ HEL, I, 36-37.

¹⁵ His obituary of Stubbs is printed in Frederick William Maitland, *Collected Papers* (CP), 3 vols., ed. by Herbert Albert Laurens Fischer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), III, 495-511. Privately he wrote to Vinogradoff drastically "All that you say about Stubbs and Seebohm and Maine is, I dare say, very true if you regard them as European, not merely English, phenomenon and attribute to them a widespread significance -and doubtless it is very well that Englishmen should see this- still looking at England only and out insular ways of thinking I see Stubbs and Maine as two pillars of conservatism while, as to Seebohm, I think that his book is utterly devoid of political importance".

¹⁶ HEL, 38.

imagine his reaction to a sentence of Maitland's such as "that the State is a highly peculiar group-unit"¹⁷. Stubbs seems does not refer to him nor is there any reference to him in his writings although Maitland often cites Stubbs Constitutional History.

Maitland had not originally wanted to study law but political philosophy, inspired by the philosopher, Sir Henry Sidgwick. He didn't get the crucial job in Cambridge, was forced to go to London and practice at the bar. The critical moment of his life was, while still working as a lawyer but returning regularly to the University, lying on the grass in an Oxford park on 11th May 1884 with the Russian emigrant and enthusiast for English legal and social history Paul Vinogradoff¹⁸. Vinogradoff reminded him about the unpublished records of medieval legal history in the Public Record Office. In fact, Maitland had already visited the Public Record Office but Vinogradoff seems to have planted the mission in him to really get to grips with them. Curious as he was and as a Gloucestershire man he made his way there the next day and ordered the first plea roll of the counts of Gloucester 1221, out of which emerged his first publication on medieval legal history¹⁹.

Out of his meetings with Vinogradoff developed an important friendship. There were other continental influences: Maitland, whose mother died a year after his birth, had been brought up by a series of German governesses. He himself attributed the work of Karl Friedrich von Savigny "Die Geschichte des römischen Rechts" and Stubbs to the fundamental influences on him. Stubbs he found interesting²⁰ but Savigny inspiring and one of his first projects was to translate it, which he never managed²¹. A mere glance at Savigny shows why: both hated generalisation, both believed in relativity of facts and truth, both avoided the anachronism of projecting later developments back into the Middle Ages, both wrote in an intimate and informal style to which I can best apply the German adjective, "verbindlich". What is more with Savigny, Maitland took over the preoccupation of continental lawyers of the eighteenth century with the subject of "possession" and "tenure" which had never played the same central role in learned legal discussion until Maitland. The legacy of Savigny and his fascination with German scholarship this can largely be seen in his translation of part of the third volume of Otto Gierke's monumental work *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht* under the title *Political Theories of the Middle Ages*. However, Maitland realised that continental inspiration had its limits: "Explorations in foreign climes", he wrote "may often tell us what to look for but never what to find"²².

So, we can roughly assemble the influences on Maitland. It was this fascination with the original records, which many of us share, the interest in the Middle Ages

¹⁷ Gierke, 9.

¹⁸ For the meeting of the two and Vinogradoff's influence see Cecil Herbert Stuart Fifoot, *Frederick William Maitland. A Life* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 60. Vinogradoff is less effusive about Maitland than vice versa.

¹⁹ *Curia Regia, The Pleas of the Crown for the County of Gloucester before the Abbot of Reading, 1221* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1884).

²⁰ On the Constitutional History "I found it in a London club and read it because I found it interesting" in Maitland, *CP*, III, 503. His reservation about it is expressed in the subsequent sentence where said that he "fell more completely under its domination than those who have passed through schools of history are likely to fall." Henry Arthur Holland, p. 11.

²¹ The comparison is made by Fifoot, 52-3.

²² Cit. in Bell, 19.

for which Stubbs was presumably responsible plus his openness for very unbritish ideas of Savigny which with his own brilliance contributed to his achievement.

* * *

Maitland was naturally writing history under completely different conditions from us today though reading him one sometimes forgets it. He lived in an interesting transitional phase. At the beginning of his career, he pursued history as a hobby—a good old tradition of the English gentry to which he belonged. He shared their interest, by the way, in local history—a number of his publications deal with his home town of Cambridge²³. He originally came from a gentry family in Gloucestershire whose ancestors had been lawyers, clergymen and civil servants and historians. His private income enabled him a certain amount of freedom. However as the Victorian Age proceeded, it became clear that Maitland's resources were inadequate to support him and that his career at the bar was likely to be so limited that he would be unable to live from it.

The universities of Oxford and Cambridge were expanding the scope of jobs on a hitherto unknown scale²⁴. Maitland's first two applications for fellowships were unsuccessful. He owed his academic survival to his old teacher Sir Henry Sidgwick's generous decision to fund a readership privately, especially for Maitland. This private patronage is a curious move backwards but it was essential to save Maitland. When the temporary Readership ran out in 1885, Maitland was elected to the Downing Chair of Law. It was a remarkable year for the study of history: In 1885 the historical tripos was reformed, and the arts faculty in Oxford divided into three faculties, of which one was modern history. In the following year the English Historical Review was founded. It is, however, fascinating to see that he was offered Lord Acton's chair of History in Oxford when Acton retired in 1902²⁵.

Despite the beginnings of professionalization, the professions were not so rigidly separated then as now. Who today would offer a lawyer, who had never studied history, the Regius Chair at Oxford especially as a certain coolness has arisen between historians who study medieval law and the few lawyers who do so? Maitland was amazed and remarked that if he had been offered a bishopric (he was not a Christian) he wouldn't have been more surprised. The age in which he lived in was, however, one of his great advantages and disadvantages. Nowadays we all sit in our specialised little holes. Even within Medieval History, we don't even know the colleagues from the other epochs. In Maitland's day, the profession of University teacher was so small that the good people soon made contact with each other on an international basis and enjoyed interchange with their colleagues in the neighbouring subjects like philosophy, moral science, law, geography too. This was one of their advantages. Maitland recognised it and in his Inaugural Lecture for the Downing Chair with the title "Why the History of English Law has not been written" pleaded that scholars should be open for interdisciplinary impulses²⁶. In his introduction

²³ For example, parts of *Township and Borough*, cit. supra.

²⁴ For the development of historical studies see Peter R. H. Slee, *Learning and a Liberal Education. The Study of Modern History in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Manchester 1800-1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press: 1986).

²⁵ Fifoot, 219.

²⁶ On the subject of 'Why English Law has not been written' published in Maitland, *CP*, 480-97.

to the Ford Lectures on the subject of Township and Borough he had to apologise because he had “passed too often and too rapidly backwards and forwards between the domain of economic history and the domain of law or even of legal metaphysics”²⁷.

His disadvantage was that the profession of history was only in its early days and it was neither academically or institutionally organised. One couldn’t do a Ph.D. in history anywhere and there was no Institute of Historical Research. Outside Oxbridge, London and a few places, one couldn’t even study it. Maitland saw this and his establishment of the Selden Society was an attempt to provide an organisational framework for the study of medieval legal history (which he wouldn’t have interpreted as narrowly as we do) and also as a possibility for training young people in the use of texts²⁸.

The inspiration which Maitland enjoyed was not merely interdisciplinary. He lived in an interesting place (or places – London and Cambridge) at an interesting time and in a privileged “network”²⁹. He was related by marriage to the composer Ralph Vaughan Williams, to Leslie Stephen, the author of the Dictionary of National Biography, whose daughter was Virginia Woolf, at the edge of the famous Bloomsbury group³⁰. At the end of the day, he was a man of his day living in a fascinating age but also ahead of his time. As the famous historian George Trevelyan said, “he was using medieval law as a tool to prise open to our view the mind of medieval man”. What really interested Maitland were people’s minds. He was interested in the history of mentality and cultural history not merely quidquid agunt homines which still preoccupied many of his contemporaries and which is depressingly still a strong feature of medieval history. If he returned today, his delight at the progress in medieval legal history would be slightly dampened by the lack of interest of the writers in the society which created the law and while no doubt thrilled at the subsequent activity of the Selden Society, he would be disappointed that not more Year Books had been published. However, there can be no doubt that especially recent developments in social history, in everyday history and medieval archaeology would have fascinated him.

²⁷ Given in 1897, published Cambridge 1898, p. 6.

²⁸ For the founding of the Selden Society see Bell, pp. 241- 247.

²⁹ For the Cambridge side of it see Sheldon Rothblatt, *The Revolution of the Dons. Cambridge and Society in Victorian England* (London: Faber, 1968).

³⁰ His last book was the *Life and Letters Leslie Stephen* (London: Duckworth, 1906). Stephen was a relative by marriage.

Chronology

1850. He was born in the county of Gloucestershire. First education at Eton.
 1869-1872. Studies of Philosophy and Moral Sciences at Trinity College, Cambridge.
 1876. Trained as a lawyer at Lincoln's Inn, London, he was called to the bar in 1876 and practiced jurisprudence for seven years.
 1885. Reader in English Law at Cambridge.
 1886. He founded, together with other lawyers, the Selden Society, dedicated to the publication of early English law documents, and he remained its literary director until the end of his life.
 1888. Downing professor of the laws of England at Cambridge.
 Academic recognitions: honorary fellow of Trinity College, honorary bencher of Lincoln's Inn, honorary degrees bestowed by the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Moscow and Cracow. He was one of the original fellows of the British Academy, founded in 1902, and corresponding member of the Royal Prussian and the Royal Bavarian Academies.
 1906. He died at Las Palmas (Canary Islands).

Selected bibliography

1. Books

- The Pleas of the Crown for the County of Gloucester before the Abbot of Reading, 1221* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1884).
Justice and Police (London: Macmillan & Co., 1885; New York: Russell & Russell, 1972; with a new introduction by Henry Paolucci, New York: AMS Press, 1974).
The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I, 2 vols (Cambridge: The University Press, 1895; 2nd enlarged ed., Cambridge: The University Press, 1898; Cambridge: The University Press, 1923). Written with Sir Frederick Pollock, but really by himself, except one chapter.
Domesday Book and Beyond (Cambridge: The University Press, 1897; Cambridge: The University Press, 1921), with an introd. by Bryan Lyon (New York: Norton, 1966); with foreword by James Clarke Holt (Cambridge: The University Press, 1987).
Township and Borough (Cambridge: The University Press, 1898; Cambridge: The University Press, 1964), which were his Ford lectures delivered at Oxford University in 1897.
Roman Canon Law in the Church of England; six essays (London: Methuen, 1898; Union, N.J.: Lawbook Exchange, 1998).
English Law and the Renaissance (1901; Littleton, Colo.: F.B. Rothman, 1985; Union, N.J.: Lawbook Exchange, 2000).
The Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen (London: Duckworth, 1906; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906; London: Duckworth, 1968).
 Posthumously, two sets of Maitland's lectures were published:
The constitutional History of England, a course of lectures delivered by F. W. Maitland, ed. by Herbert A. L. Fisher (Cambridge: The University Press, 1908; Union, N.J.: Lawbook Exchange, 2001).
Equity, also the Forms of Action at Common Law, two courses of lectures by F.W. Maitland, ed. by William J. Whittaker (Cambridge: The University Press, 1909, 1910, 1916, 1929, 1936; Littleton, Colo.: F.B. Rothman & Co., 1984).
Bracton's Note-Book: a collection of cases decided in the King's Court during the Reign of Henry the Third (London: C.J. Clay & sons, 1887; Cambridge: 1920, 1961; Littleton, Colo.: F.B. Rothman, 1983; Buffalo, N.Y.: W.S. Hein, 1999). (This is an edition of the 13th-century English jurist Henry de Bracton's collection of cases).

Three Rolls of the King's Court in the Reign of Richard the First, A.D. 1194-1195, Pipe Roll Society (London: Wyman & sons, 1891).

Records of the Parliament Holden at Westminster, on the 28th Day of February, A. D. 1305, Rolls Series (London: 1893).

For the Selden Society he produced, among other editions:

Select Pleas of the Crown (London: Selden Society, 1888)

Select Pleas in Manorial and other Seigniorial Courts (London: 1889)

Besides, the first three volumes of the Society's Year Book series, covering the years 1307-1311 (London: 1903, 1905, 1907 posthumously).

The Collected Papers of F. W. Maitland, Downing Professor of the Laws of England, ed. by Herbert A.L. Fisher, 3 vols (Cambridge: The University Press, 1911). This work contains 69 of Maitland's articles and reviews.

Selected Essays, ed. by Harold Dexter Hazeltine, Gaillard Thomas Lapsley, and Percy Henry Winfield (Cambridge: The University Press, 1936; repr. Freeport, New York, 1968).

The Letters of Frederic William Maitland, ed. by Cecil Herbert Stuart Fifoot (Cambridge: 1965; London: 1965)

2. Bibliography about Frederic William Maitland

Herbert A.L. Fisher, *Frederic William Maitland, Downing Professor of the Laws of England: a Biographical Sketch* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1910).

William Warwick Buckland, 'F. W. Maitland', *Cambridge Law Journal*, I (1921-1923), 279-301.

Henry Arthur Hollond, *Frederic William Maitland, 1850-1906. A Memorial Address*, Selden Society Annual Address (London: Quaritch, 1953).

James R. Cameron, *F. W. Maitland and the History of English Law* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961).

Henry Esmond Bell, *Maitland: a Critical Examination and Assessment* (London: Black, 1965).

Cecil Herbert Stuart Fifoot, *Frederic William Maitland. A Life* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971).

Geoffrey Rudolph Elton, *F. W. Maitland* (New Haven/London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1985).

Clemens Baeumker (1853 – 1924)

Maria-Jesús SOTO-BRUNA
(Universidad de Navarra)

Introduction. Portrait intellectuel

En 1913, à l'occasion du soixantième anniversaire d'âge de Clemens Baeumker, la prestigieuse publication périodique qu'il stimula lui-même dès l'année 1891, à savoir, les *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, édita un supplément spécial en hommage à son fondateur et comme reconnaissance de son grand labeur. Collaborèrent à ce volume de grands médiévistes très connus sur le plan international; ainsi, en sus des originaires du milieu germanique, comme J. Geysen, G. Wunderle, M. Wittmann, M. Horten, G. Graf, B. Geysen, A. Schneider, M. Grabmann, E. Lutz, L. Baur, M. Baumgartner, J. A. Endres, O. Renz, P. O. Keicher, A. Daniels. A. Dryoff, S. Hahn, G. Bülow, Fr. Nauen, J. Fischer, E. Krebs et P. Minge, reconnurent sa tâche les auteurs comme J. de Ghellinck, et M. De Wulf (Louvain), E. Vansteenberghe (France) et l'espagnol P. Blanco Soto. Demeurent significatives les paroles par le truchement desquelles ce dernier mit en exergue la contribution de Clemens Baeumker au médiévisme: «Le labeur entreprit et avec tant de réussite en l'espace de tant d'années par le savant professeur Dr. Clemens Baeumker, est digne d'éloge et d'admiration pour tous ceux-là qui comprennent combien il est difficile de restituer les textes anciens, les uns mutilés, d'autres incomplets, dans leur état originel; deviner la pensée de l'auteur enveloppée parfois de nébulosités par ignorance ou négligence du copiste et leur donner à la publicité châtiés et corrigés pour que d'autres en savourent et pénétrèrent le contenu, formant ainsi ces magnifiques synthèses de l'histoire de la culture d'un peuple qui, sans ces pierres polies et taillées par des ouvriers intelligents et laborieux, serait impossible de construire»¹.

Plus tard, en 1927 –trois années après la mort de Clemens Baeumker– cette série de publications voulut se rappeler de son fondateur réunissant certains des plus significatifs articles d'investigation de l'auteur. Cette fois l'édition fut précédée d'une biographie intellectuelle écrite par un de ses plus proches collaborateurs et renommé médiéviste, Martin Grabmann. En plus de faire minutieusement le compte rendu des travaux réalisés de son vivant, Grabmann souligna que l'importance de sa figure se distingue aussi prenant en compte les projets et perspectives ouvertes pour le futur dans l'investigation de la pensée médiévale. Baeumker aurait ainsi découvert et signalé des chemins importants que devrait parcourir l'étude postérieure; et cela à la suite des successives découvertes qu'il était en train de faire au

¹ Pedro Blanco Soto, «El primer libro de filosofía impreso en el Nuevo Mundo», in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag Clemens Baeumker*, Supplementband (1) (Münster: Vg. der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913), p. 365.

fur et à mesure qu'il éditait et faisait la lumière sur les manuscrits des œuvres médiévales d'une importance capitale pour la connaissance et l'édification de l'histoire de la philosophie de cette période. D'où une mise en relief de sa figure au moyen des phrases suivantes: «Le portrait scientifique d'un grand investigateur se découvre, non seulement à partir de ses œuvres publiées, mais aussi partant des annotations et matériaux recueillis de divers livres, quand bien même ils n'auraient pas abouti à la lumière. Puisque la plus profonde essence de l'être humain ne se montre pas seulement en ce qu'il a fait et obtenu, mais aussi en ce qu'il a envisagé»². Par le biais de ces paroles, Martin Grabmann voulait alors reconnaître le travail et les projets que Clemens Baeumker avait apportés, avec son infatigable effort, à l'investigation de l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale au début du siècle passé; travaux et projets recueillis – comme il été dit- par Grabmann lui-même dans la biographie intellectuelle de notre auteur qu'il publia dans le volume mentionné, le XXV, des *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*³, organe international pour l'édition des textes médiévaux et études monographiques sur des thèmes et les auteurs centraux de la philosophie de cette époque.

Il s'agira de montrer par la suite la juste appréciation des citations exposées. Ainsi, en premier lieu, sera mis en évidence la figure de Clemens Baeumker dans la période historique au cours de laquelle s'effectue son investigation au sujet de la philosophie médiévale, signalant aussi ses plus importantes publications. En second lieu, sera expliqué ce qui constitue l'une de ses plus grandes contributions à la spéculation médiévale, c'est-à-dire, la découverte de l'importance de la réception du platonisme et du néoplatonisme pour la postérieure systématisation de la philosophie au Moyen Âge. Pour terminer avec un exposé sur sa compréhension et caractérisation de la pensée médiévale.

Investigation dans l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale.

a) Données biographiques

Clemens Baeumker est né le 17 septembre 1853 à Paderborn et fut éduqué au sein d'une famille profondément catholique. Il commença sa formation humaniste au *gymnasium* de sa ville natale, où son père exerçait la fonction de professeur. En 1872 il entama les études de philosophie et de théologie dans l' *Akademie* épiscopale de Paderborn de cette époque et les continua à Münster, où il entreprend par surcroît des études de philologie. Baeumker lui-même s'est rappelé de son professeur de philosophie de Paderborn, Joseph Vigener, qui à travers ses leçons le familiarisa avec le *Cursus philosophicus* de Jean de Saint Thomas, et au moyen des exercices pratiques l'initia aux écrits de Saint Thomas d'Aquin et de Saint Bonaventure. Rappelons que Vigener se fit connaître comme spécialiste en

² Martin Grabmann, 'Clemens Baeumker und die Erforschung der Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie', in *Gesammelte Vorträge und Aufsätze von Clemens Baeumker. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, ed. By Martin Grabmann, Band XXV, Heft 1/2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927, p. 13.

³ A partir de l'année 1928 (vol. XXVII), les *Beiträge* étendent leur domaine d'action à l'Histoire de la Théologie, ce qui se fait noter dans leur titre même.

gnoséologie thomiste avec une monographie sur la théorie des idées chez Thomas d'Aquin⁴.

De même, Cl. Baeumker reçoit une grande influence du franciscain P. Ignatius Jeiler, ami, de surcroît, de la famille⁵. Pour cette époque, Baeumker s'était d'ores et déjà introduit systématiquement dans les écrits d'Aristote et effectué des investigations sur les fondements de la pensée scolastique, en sus d'avoir travaillé de façon profonde l'oeuvre de Thomas d'Aquin. Cette étroite familiarité avec la philosophie thomiste constituera un appui solide et un guide sûr pour ses investigations historiques postérieures.

En l'année 1883 – quatre ans après la parution de l'encyclique *Aeternis Patris* – il fut appelé à l'Université de Breslau comme professeur ordinaire de philosophie, où il demeura pendant 17 ans; jusqu'à ce que en 1900 il alla à Bonn comme professeur titulaire de la chaire de philosophie. En 1903 il obtint l'honneur de remplacer Windelband à Strasbourg. Quand en l'année 1912, le baron Georg von Hertling, entra comme Ministre Président au sommet du Gouvernement bavarois, il appela Baeumker pour qu'il le remplaçât dans la chaire. Au moment de la révolution de 1918, il était recteur de l'Université de Munich⁶. Les durs événements et les difficultés pour un travail intellectuel serein, épuisèrent l'investigateur et professeur de philosophie, qui voyait s'ébranler sa santé, jusque quand il mourut le 7 octobre 1924. «Il possédait – a écrit à son sujet F. Van Steenberghe – un ensemble de qualités qui, de façon rare se présentent réunies: la prudence, l'attention minutieuse et la patience de l'érudit; l'esprit constructif de l'historien et la sagesse du philosophe. Il transcrivit et collationna une quantité énorme de textes; la documentation accumulée dans ses oeuvres révèle la richesse de son information. En outre, dans l'investigation et l'ordonnance de ces matériaux il fut toujours guidé par une pensée de synthèse et stimulé par l'idéal de rénovation philosophique et théologique qui se trouve au centre du mouvement néo-scolastique»⁷.

De sa première époque – et comme apport à une plus grande connaissance de la philosophie grecque – on doit se rappeler de la *Dissertation* de Paderborn, 1887: *Über des Aristoteles Lehre von den äusseren und inneren Sinnesvermögen*; et, de la même manière, l'oeuvre de Münster, 1890: *Das problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie*. Cette dernière oeuvre eut une grande signification, puisque l'importance de la doctrine de la matière et la forme – en métaphysique, philosophie de la nature et psychologie – est connue dans la philosophie scolastique depuis le début du XIII^e siècle. Baeumker montre bien les différentes théories de l'Antiquité sur la forme et la matière et son adoption au Moyen Age⁸; ce thème va occuper beaucoup de ses éditions et investigations postérieures.

⁴ Cfr. M. Grabmann, p. 8.

⁵ Sur l'influence que ce franciscain eut sur notre auteur: Clemens Baeumker, 'Erinnerungen an P. Ignatius Jeiler. Mit Briefen von P. Ignatius an den Verfasser', *Franziskanische Studien*, 11 (1924), 33-49.

⁶ Cfr. F. Van Steenberghe, 'Clemens Baeumker', in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et géographie ecclésiastiques*, A. Baudrillart, A. Vogt, U. Rouzières, dir. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1912-2000) VII, 1931, col. 180-184. Du même auteur: «Figures de Médiévistes», in Fernand Van Steenberghe, *Introduction à l'étude de la Philosophie Médiévale*, Préface de Georges Van Riet (Louvain: Publications Universitaires / Paris: Béatrices-Nauwelaerts, 1974), pp. 283-333.

⁷ F. Van Steenberghe, p. 285.

⁸ Le livre de Baeumker fut discuté par P. Gundisalv Feldner O. Pr., à qui l'auteur répondit dans un article paru dans *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* de 1898: 'Herr Fr. Gundisalv Feldner und mein 'Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie'', pp. 182-189.

Quand en 1872 Baeumker entra à l'Université, il y avait déjà un demi siècle que les études sur la philosophie médiévale avaient pris un nouvel essor en Europe ; et cela après le discrédit qu'avait souffert cette période de la pensée –d'une manière générale– au cours de la Renaissance et pendant l'époque moderne et l'Illustration. A cet égard, il sied de signaler en premier lieu l'année 1919, quand l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres de Paris proposa comme thème de concours la question des traductions latines d'Aristote. En fut lauréat le travail d'Aimable Jourdain, *Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote*, qui fut traduit en allemand en 1831 et actualisé et réédité en 1843 par Charles Jourdain, fils de l'auteur⁹. L'œuvre de A. Jourdain domina l'investigation en philosophie médiévale pendant plus d'un siècle, ayant été à son tour continuée avec du nouveau matériel.

En 1857, l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques de Paris proposa comme thème de concours la philosophie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin ; Charles Jourdain en fut lauréat, par son travail –publié en 1858– *La philosophie de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Ces travaux constituèrent sans doute un stimulant pour l'extension des investigations médiévales, tant en France que dans le reste de l'Europe¹⁰. Il ya lieu de rappeler à cet égard, en plus de l'œuvre de Victor Cousin, les investigations de Charles Thurot au sujet de la grammaire médiévale et sa philosophie du langage¹¹ et l'investigation de Renan sur Averroès et l'averroïsme¹² ; ainsi que l'histoire réalisée par Delisle sur les collections de manuscrits dans la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris¹³, et, dans ce même domaine, le travail de B. Hauréau¹⁴.

Pour sa part, l'Italie vit une renaissance de la philosophie thomiste, bien décrite par A. Pelzer, dans son livre *Les initiateurs italiens du Néo-Thomisme contemporain*. Extrait de la *Revue Néo-Scholastique de Philosophie* (1911)¹⁵ ; sans oublier, en Espagne, les travaux de Zeferino González, Menéndez y Pelayo ou Bonilla y San Martín.

Dans le milieu allemand, plus proche sans doute, de Baeumker, il avait été publié –entre autres– l'œuvre de Staudenmaier sur Érigène¹⁶ ; en sus de l'excellente his-

⁹ Amaible Jourdain, *Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote et sur des commentaires grecs ou arabes employés par les docteurs scolastiques* (Nouv. éd. rév. et augm. par Charles Jourdain), (New York : B. Franklin, 1974).

¹⁰ Cfr. Charles Jourdain, *Excursions historiques et philosophiques à travers le Moyen Âge* (Frankfurt a. M. : Minerva Vg., 1966).

¹¹ Charles Thurot, *Extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au Moyen Âge* (1869) (Frankfurt am Main : Minerva, 1964) ; *De l'organisation de l'enseignement dans l'université de Paris* (1850), (Frankfurt am Main : Minerva, 1967).

¹² Cfr. la récente traduction en castillan : Ernesto Renan, *Averroes y el averroísmo. Ensayo histórico*. Trad. : Héctor Pacheco Pringues, Prol. : Gabriel Albiac (Madrid : Hiparión, 1992).

¹³ Leopold V. Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits latins : conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale sous les numéros 8.823 – 18.613* (1863) (Hildesheim : Olms, 1974) ; *Inventaire générale et méthodique des manuscrits français de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris : Champion, 1876).

¹⁴ Barthélemy Hauréau, *Initia operum scriptum latinorum Medii potissimum Aevi ex codicibus manuscriptis et libris impressis alphabetice digessit* (1812-1896) (Turnhout : Brepols, 1973-1974).

¹⁵ Cfr. à cet égard : *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer : études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la Scolastique médiévale offerts à Monseigneur Auguste Pelzer*, (Louvain : Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1947). Voir aussi : Amato Masnovo, *Il neo-tomismo in Italia* (Milano : Vita e Pensiero, 1923).

¹⁶ Anton Staudenmaier, *Johannes Scotus Erigena und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit* (1834), (Frankfurt am Mainz : Minerva, 1966).

toire de la philosophie médiévale de A. Stöckl¹⁷, ou les études de K. Werner sur Thomas d'Aquin, Suárez et la Scolastique tardive. Il sied de relever aussi le travail de J. Kleutgen sur la philosophie scolastique¹⁸, et celui de Carl Prantl sur l'histoire de la logique, celui-ci (ayant été ou fut un) auteur sur qui Baeumker lui-même écrivit, signalant son intérêt¹⁹.

En dépit de l'importance de ces auteurs, il faudra attendre l'œuvre de H. Denifle et F. Ehrle pour que l'investigation dans le domaine de la philosophie médiévale prenne un grand élan dans la perspective de l'extension des études des manuscrits²⁰. On peut considérer qu'à partir du *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* et de l'édition des *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* – à partir des matériaux inédits – commence une nouvelle ère dans la manière d'écrire l'histoire de la philosophie et de la théologie du Moyen Âge.

Clemens Baeumker reçoit l'influence de l'orientation vers les manuscrits donnée par ces deux investigateurs allemands et, de fait, la fondation des *Beiträge* en 1891 obéit à l'intérêt clair et sûr de racheter et éditer les œuvres des auteurs médiévaux. Il vaudrait, de fait, la peine de suivre de près les manuscrits utilisés par Baeumker dans ses investigations au sujet des divers domaines de l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale; puisque, en observant le matériel travaillé, on se rend compte de sa propre conception de la philosophie en cette période. A cet égard, il y a lieu de souligner que, d'une manière très précise, son projet de mener à bon terme une édition du *Fons vitae* de Ibn Gabirol et, de la même manière, de la *Métaphysique* d'Avicenne signalent une spéciale perspicacité pour les tâches réellement importantes qui concernaient l'étude de la philosophie médiévale à un moment où les investigations dans ce domaine étaient – malgré les élans susmentionnés – encore *terra incognita*. Bien que le projet sur Avicenne ne pût être mené à bonne fin, l'édition de l'œuvre d'Avicébron est demeurée comme un jalon décisif dans la compréhension de la pensée du Moyen Âge.

Il s'avère aussi intéressant d'apprécier que le manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris utilisé – entre autres – par Baeumker pour son édition du *Fons vitae*, c'est-à-dire, celui correspondant au Cod. Lat. 14 700, contenait de surcroît, des œuvres d'Algazel; le *De divisione philosophiae* et le *De ortu scientiarum* de Alfarabi; des traités d'Adelard de Bath, et l'ouvrage connu, de Dominicus Gundissalinus, le *De unitate et uno*. Sans doute, les publications postérieures de Baeumker maintiendront une étroite relation avec ces manuscrits.

Les investigations de Baeumker dans le domaine de l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale acquièrent alors, avec la fondation des *Beiträge*, une grande envergure, contribuant d'une manière décisive à la connaissance de textes et investigations relatifs à l'histoire de la scolastique. Il se révéla, pour cela, comme une personnalité innovatrice dans l'investigation et avec une grande capacité pour l'organisation de l'activité scientifique. A 23 ans de son existence, et à l'occasion de l'édition du volume 14, Baeumker spécifia rétrospectivement la finalité et la signification

¹⁷ Albert Stöckl, *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (1864-1866), 4 vols., (Aalen : Scientia Vg., 1868).

¹⁸ Joseph Kleutgen, *La philosophie scolastique*, trans by R.P. Constant Sierp (Paris : Gaume Frères et J. Duprey, 1869).

¹⁹ Carl Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abelande* (Graz : Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1955) ; reimpr. de Leipzig, 1855; Cl. Baeumker, 'Carl Prantl', in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 55 (1910).

²⁰ Cfr. M. Grabmann, p. 5.

internationale de l'entreprise initiée avec ces publications: «Les *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, que je fondai en l'année 1891, obéirent à l'objectif initial de réunir des travaux qui contiendront la totalité de la pensée spéculative du Moyen Âge, se basant fondamentalement sur les sources. Aussi ne se limitèrent-ils pas seulement au patrimoine latin, mais dès le début ils ont aussi orienté leur attention vers la philosophie médiévale orientale, notamment dans la mesure où celle-ci a eu une grande signification dans l'édification de la scolastique occidentale. Ils ont également abordé des investigations sur l'Antiquité et la Patristique, eu égard au fait que le développement historique de leurs idées a trouvé une claire source d'inspiration au Moyen Âge. Ils ne se sont pas non plus fermés à la spéculation théologique médiévale, bien qu'ils prissent en considération la spécificité propre de la théologie et de la philosophie respectivement. Ils n'ont pas non plus tourné le dos aux travaux sur la science au Moyen Âge»²¹.

Le volume 18 se clôturait par des paroles de remerciement à l'endroit de celui qui avait été un de leurs plus étroits collaborateurs, G. von Hertling. Baeumker lui-même spécifiait alors, que les *Beiträge* envisageaient une amicale, mais impartiale, immersion dans le monde de la philosophie médiévale de telle manière que ils pussent proportionner une connaissance strictement scientifique de son avènement selon l'étude des sources; une investigation, en somme, de la richesse de ses multiples formes et irradiations et une sereine appréciation de ses contenus²². Plusieurs années après leur fondation, les *Beiträge* furent édités en collaboration avec G. v. Hertling, Fr. Ehrle, S. I., M. Baumgartner et M. Grabmann²³, la charge du travail de la rédaction ayant toujours incombée à Baeumker. Du vivant de l'auteur furent édités 25 volumes, avec environ cent monographies²⁴.

La précédente constitue sans doute l'œuvre la plus durable de notre auteur; son projet consista, effectivement, à doter l'investigation historique de la philosophie médiévale d'un organe commun de travail, selon le plan conçu par Zeller et Trendelenburg pour la philosophie antique. Autour de cette collection se réunirent les principaux historiens allemands de la philosophie scolastique. De nos jours, et depuis 1970, elle continue à être publiée sous le sous titre de *Neue Folge*²⁵; cependant demeure maintenue la même inspiration que l'assigna C. Baeumker.

b) Notice bibliographique

Nous relevons par la suite quelques unes des publications dans les *Beiträge* qui procèdent de la propre plume de Clemens Baeumker. Le premier volume est justement l'une des plus précieuses éditions dans le domaine de l'histoire de la

²¹ Cité par M. Grabmann, pp. 16-17.

²² Cfr. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Band XVIII (Münster : 1919), clôture du volume, après le fascicule (*Heft*) 6.

²³ Martin Grabmann, le plus illustre historien médiéviste du moment, succéda en 1925 à Clemens Baeumker à la direction de cette série.

²⁴ Autres collections importantes paraissent à cette période; parmi les quelles, peuvent être soulignées les suivantes: *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (dès 1907); *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, stimulée par Heinrich Denifle et Franz Ehrle; *Les Philosophes Belges*, par De Wulf; les *Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale*, de Etienne Gilson; les *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, dirigés par E. Gilson et P. Gabriel Théry O. Pr.

²⁵ En collaboration avec la Görresgesellschaft (L. Hödl et W. Kluxen). Cfr. <http://www.aschendorff.de/buch>.

philosophie médiévale : Avincebrolis (Ibn Gabirol) *Fons vitae. Ex arabico in latinum translatus ab Johanne Hispano et Dominico Gundissalino*, dont le travail soigneux de l'édition l'occupa de 1892 à 1895, la consacrant au Cardinal Kopp, par la médiation duquel il put accéder à un manuscrit conservé dans la Bibliothèque Capitulaire de Tolède. Comme on le sait, cette œuvre eut une grande influence dans la scolastique du XIII^e siècle, ce qui fut mis en exergue par M. Wittmann dans l'essai qu'il publia dans les *Beiträge* au sujet de la réception de Ibn Gabirol chez Thomas d'Aquin²⁶.

Le *Fons vitae* d'Avicébron, reçu dans l'occident latin de la main de la traduction de Domingo Gundisalvo et Juan Hispano, vient en effet rappeler la polémique sur la question de la distinction entre Dieu et le monde dans la perspective de la création.

La création est plusieurs fois expliquée comme l'union de la matière –pure possibilité– avec la forme : aucun de ces éléments n'aurait une existence propre avant l'acte créateur, qui fait surgir ces deux éléments du néant. Ainsi donc, et comme pour se séparer définitivement du matérialisme antique, on soutient de façon catégorique que la matière ne possède pas du tout l'être avant la création, excepté celui qui est le sien dans la sagesse du Créateur : l'explication, alors, de l'union de la matière et de la forme est à la fois l'explication de la création²⁷. De là provient en grande partie l'acceptation de l'hylémorphisme universel dans quelques uns des grands courants de la scolastique médiévale : tout, excepté Dieu, serait composé de matière et de forme. A partir de là, les principes présents en toute génération seront trois : la cause efficiente (*a quo*), la matière (*in quo*) et la forme (*ex quo*)²⁸.

Ibn Gabirol suppose une interprétation néoplatonicienne du platonisme originaire qui expliquait la formation du monde à partir d'une première matière. Le thème a occupé Baeumker depuis son livre –déjà cité– sur la réception du problème de la relation entre la matière et la forme au Moyen Âge ; et, postérieurement, dans ses investigations sur l'influence du néoplatonisme dans la configuration de la philosophie au Moyen Âge.

Selon la doctrine gabirolienne la matière est avant tout être en puissance, actualisée par la forme, qui lui donne l'être, la détermine à partir de l'acte de la création, qui consiste en l'union des deux principes pour former l'être en acte, qu'est la substance concrète, composée toujours de l'élément matériel et de l'élément formel ; celle-ci étant une structure qui est aussi appliquée aux dénommées substances incorporelles. Le système de l'hylémorphisme soutient de cette manière la composition primaire de la matière et de la forme comme indice de la distinction entre la créature et le Créateur.

Chez Aristote, la matière et la forme s'unissaient pour former un être concret, représentant deux ordres distincts de la réalité. La forme acquiert priorité, puisqu'elle constitue l'essence et la quiddité. Le schéma est respecté par les successeurs d'Aristote, mais les préoccupations propres du néoplatonisme introduisent dans le

²⁶ M. Wittmann, *Die Stellung des Hl. Thomas von Aquin zu Avencebrol (Ibn Gabirol)*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Band III, Heft 3 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1900).

²⁷ « La thèse *forma dat esse materiae*, adoptée par tout le XIII^e siècle, provient de Ibn Gabirol et de Gundisalvo » : F. Brunner, « Le conflit des tendances platoniciennes et aristotéliennes au Moyen Âge », in *Métaphysique d'Ibn Gabirol et de la tradition platonicienne* (Aldershot, Hampshire, Brookfield, Vermont (USA) : 1997), VIII, p. 191.

²⁸ Cfr. à propos de la source aristotélienne de l'hylémorphisme : Aristote, *Métaphysique Z*, 1035a–1039b.

péripatétisme un esprit différent. Ainsi, Ibn Gabirol professe l'universalité et la primauté de la matière. Au lieu d'être seulement le support du devenir possible, le support de tout devenir possible. Du moment que un commencement intemporel est supposé pour les créatures, il doit y avoir une matière, car cela implique un changement. A son tour, tout ce qui change doit être composé. Il existe ainsi d'une part ce qui peut arriver à être, et d'autre part ce qui reçoit l'être; «la matière n'est alors pas autre chose que la possibilité, et le possible est ce qui est soumis à la cause première. [...] Pour soutenir sa doctrine de la dualité cosmique, Ibn Gabirol signale les arguments suivants: comme le Créateur est un, le créé doit être différent de Lui. L'unité première de Dieu se suffit à elle-même, mais l'unité qui la suit reçoit l'unité: elle doit être forme et matière. Tout le créé, dans la mesure où il est fini, reçoit une forme. Tant l'intelligible que le sensible se divise en deux éléments: la forme et l'informé, le déterminant et le déterminé, la différence et le genre. Il s'avère convenable à la volonté de divine de faire une chose et son contraire, puisque faire l'un et l'autre est plus constitutif de la perfection que de faire seulement l'un ou l'autre. Enfin, la matière et la forme constituent ce qui introduit la diversité dans l'univers, ce qui fait que les choses ne soient pas entièrement identiques ni entièrement autres (ou distinctes), et sont les deux principes de la génération de toutes les choses»²⁹. Voici comment un des problèmes capitaux de la métaphysique de tous les temps reprend avec vigueur sa discussion, à savoir, la perpétuelle question de l'un et du multiple. Et comment se démontre, finalement, la pertinence de l'édition du *Fons vitae* du côté de Clemens Baeumker en ce moment historique.

Par ailleurs, il convient de rappeler que l'hylémorphisme gabirolien fut connu dans les grandes synthèses du XIII^e siècle; occupant, en somme, chez Thomas d'Aquin, un lieu de critique. A. Forest le caractérisa comme «le véritable adversaire de Saint Thomas»³⁰. L'on peut, à cet effet, dire de façon anticipée que le noyau de la critique thomiste se réfère à l'impossibilité d'admettre l'existence d'authentiques substances spirituelles, si l'on accepte la composition universelle de la matière et de la forme pour tout le créé³¹. En un premier moment, Avicbron aurait confondu l'ordre logique avec l'ordre réel; pensa en effet que à la composition logique du genre et de l'espèce correspond dans les choses une composition réelle parallèle. Ainsi, en tout ce qui est défini par le truchement du genre et de la différence, à la matière correspond le rôle du genre tandis que la forme exerce la fonction de la différence. Et suppose que les termes «être en puissance» et être «sujet réceptif» sont équivalents³².

Selon Thomas d'Aquin, Avicbron introduisit la thèse de l'hylémorphisme pour expliquer la multiplicité des substances spirituelles: la matière serait le sujet que les formes diversifient. Par surcroît, s'unifie ainsi l'ordre du créé, puisque toutes les choses possèdent quelque chose en commun: le sujet de la réceptivité ou matière, et différent par la forme de la spiritualité ou de la corporalité. Pour cela –comme

²⁹ F. Brunner, «Sur l'hylémorphisme d'Ibn Gabirol», in *Métaphysique d'Ibn Gabirol et de la tradition platonicienne*, op. cit., II, pp. 28-29. Cfr. le *Fons vitae* de l'édition de Cl. Baeumker, IV et V.

³⁰ Aimé Forest, *Structure métaphysique du concret selon saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris: Vrin, 1931), p. 87.

³¹ Cfr. Thomas d'Aquin, *De ente et essentia*, In II Sent d III, q. 1 a. 1, *De substantiis separatis*, c V, S Th, q. 50 a. 2.

³² Cfr. Fernand Brunner, *Platonisme et aristotélisme. La critique d'Ibn Gabirol par saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Louvain-Paris: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, Eds. Beatrice-Nauwelaerts, 1965), pp. 39-46.

il été dit– demeurerait assurée la distinction Dieu-monde, puisque tout ce qui n'est pas Dieu représente de la sorte le caractère de la dualité et de la structuration. Demeure assurée, enfin, la finitude radicale de toute créature, ainsi que de la substance spirituelle, qui ne peut pas être pure forme, puisque la forme dit de soi actualité et, par conséquent, infinitude; d'où la nécessité qu'elle soit reçue et limitée dans une matière.

Pour Thomas d'Aquin, il est impossible que les êtres intellectuels se composent de matière, d'une autre manière l'on ne pourrait expliquer leur activité particulière. Alors, l'on ne doit pas chercher la limitation qui correspond aux substances incorporelles créées dans la ligne de la matière –cela impliquerait un retour à la conception présocratique de la matière–, mais dans la ligne de la distinction entre l'essence et l'existence. En définitive, l'on doit parler de l'être de façon analogue, et non pas à partir de l'univocité qui suppose l'admission d'une matière pour toutes les choses³³. Que l'on prenne en compte que la source thomasiennne est justement l'édition que reprit Baeumker pour l'éditer de manière critique.

L'édition de Baeumker couvre de surcroît une spéciale signification, prenant en compte l'absence de l'original arabe. Les *Indices nominum et rerum* occupent 160 pages, et montrent, non seulement le contenu du *Fons vitae*, mais nous transmettent en sus une profonde perspective sur le développement historique de la terminologie scolastique. C'est dire que, effectivement, sous l'influence des traductions en latins des œuvres qui procèdent de la pensée arabe, se développe dans la scolastique une nouvelle terminologie latine; comme l'a écrit Martin Grabmann: «Le mode des traductions latines de Domingo Gundisalvo et de Juan Hispano a eu une grande importance et signification pour le développement successif des notions et concepts scolastiques; ce sur quoi de profondes investigations n'ont pas encore été entreprises. (...) Avec son édition critique de la traduction latine du *Fons vitae* Baeumker a offert une source de premier rang pour la pensée scolastique, proportionnant par cela un grand service à l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale»³⁴. L'acceptation du fait que les traductions tolédiennes modifièrent le développement de la philosophie occidentale constitue déjà effectivement, aujourd'hui déjà un fait sûr. Recueillant en ce point un commun consensus entre les investigateurs, il a été souligné de nos jours que «l'histoire de l'Université de Paris au XIII siècle est sans doute indissociable de l'histoire des traductions du Corpus de la science arabe»³⁵.

³³ Cfr. Tomás d'Aquin, *De anima*, a. 6. Josep I. Saranyana, 'Sobre la inmortalidad de las sustancias espirituales (Santo Tomás versus Avicbrón)', *Revista di Filosofia Neoscolastica*, 70 (1978), 63-97, où l'auteur de cet article rappelle que Thomas d'Aquin consacre quatre chapitres du *De substantiis separatis* à l'hylémorphisme universel d'Avicbrón.

³⁴ Martin Grabmann, "Clemens Baeumker und die Erforschung der Geschichte der mittelaltelichen Philosophie", *op. cit.*, p. 20. Cfr. sur Dominicus Gundissalinus: María Jesús Soto Bruna, Concepción Alonso de Real, *De processionem mundi. Estudio y edición crítica del tratado de Domingo Gundisalvo* (Pamplona: Eunsa, Colección de Pensamiento medieval y renacentista, 1999); s'y référer en ce qui concerne la bibliographie fondamentale sur cet auteur et ses traductions, pp. 97-107 et l' "Index des fréquences", pp. 237-262.

³⁵ Abdelali Elamrani-Jamal, "La réception de la philosophie arabe à l'Université de Paris au XVIII siècle", in Charles Butterworth and Blake A. Kesel, eds., *The introduction of Arabic philosophy into Europe* (Leiden-Nueva York-Colonia: Brill, 1994), p. 31; F. Saade, «El pensamiento árabe en el siglo de Sto. Tomás de Aquino», in VV. AA., *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario*, Atti del Congresso Internazionale, vol. I: Le fonti del pensiero di S. Tommaso (Napoli: Ed. Domenicani Italiani, 1974), pp. 352-360.

Au sujet du point antérieur, Baeumker lui-même a écrit: «De même que la philosophie grecque demeure divisée après l'entrée de Socrate dans la scène de la pensée, de même la philosophie du Moyen Âge latin rencontre un jalon décisif après la connaissance de l'œuvre entière d'Aristote et de la philosophie arabe»³⁶. Baeumker considère que le premier poste en ce qui concerne cette transmission de connaissances revient au philosophe Dominicus Gundissalinus, le traducteur et écrivain espagnol du XIIe siècle. Dans l'étude consacrée à cet auteur, Baeumker expose les principales traductions menées à bon terme par Gundissalinus –certaines d'entre elles en collaboration avec l'espagnol Juan Hispano–, faisant aussi le compte rendu des écrites par l'arcedien espagnol avec un caractère indépendant et qui configurent les traces fondamentales d'une pensée originale³⁷.

La publication suivante de Baeumker dans les *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalter* fut la monographie éditée en 1898: *Die impossibilia des Siger von Brabant*, selon le Cod. lat. 1697 de la Bibliothèque National de Paris. Baeumker élucide, à travers elle, la biographie de cet initiateur de l'averroïsme latin³⁸.

La plus complète édition de Clemens Baeumker dans les *Beiträge*, es sans doute son œuvre sur: *Witelo, ein Philosoph und Naturforscher des 13. Jahrhunderts* (1908)³⁹, volume qu'il travailla à Breslau, Bonn et Strasbourg. Baeumker apparaît ici comme un éditeur exemplaire et un grand investigateur de l'histoire de la philosophie. Il offre en effet les clefs de la dénommée «métaphysique de la lumière» médiévale; par surcroît, il présente une histoire des démonstrations de l'existence de Dieu au Moyen Âge, ainsi que les lignes maîtresses de la théorie médiévale de la connaissance⁴⁰.

Baeumker aborda trois éditions en plus dans les *Beiträge*. Premièrement, Alfarabi: *Über den Ursprung der Wissenschaften* (1916)⁴¹, où il utilise de nouveau la traduction du Gundissalinus du *De ortu scientiarum*. Deuxièmement, Des Alfred von Sareshel (Alfredus Angelicus) Schrift: *De motu cordis* (1923)⁴². Troisièmement: *Frühmittelalterliche Glossen des angeblichen Jēpa zur Isagoge des Porphyrius* (1924)⁴³. A titre posthume parut, en 1926, (Band XXIV, Heft 5-6), le *Contra Amaurianos*, traité anonyme du XIIIe siècle.

³⁶ Cl. Baeumker, "Dominicus Gundissalinus als philosophischer Schriftsteller", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie im Mittelalters* (1927), *op. cit.*, p. 255.

³⁷ Cfr. à ce sujet l'introduction que j'ai menée à bonne fin dans l'édition citée (1999) du *De processione mundi* du Gundissalinus, Soto Bruna et Alonso del Real.

³⁸ Selon F. Van Steenberghen, l'excellente édition réalisée par Cl. Baeumker de cette œuvre, contient quelques erreurs spéculatives, consistant en l'attribution à Siger de Brabant des thèses philosophiques qui ne sont pas les siennes; cfr. F. Van Steenberghen, p. 286.

³⁹ Band III, Heft 2.

⁴⁰ Cfr. M. Grabmann, 'Cl. Baeumker und die Erforschung der Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie', *op. cit.*, p. 24. Witelo est en plus mentionné, selon l'édition de Baeumker, par Pierre Duhem, *Le Système du Monde* (Paris: Hermann, 1959), V, pp. 358 et ss.; est cité par E. Gilson, dans son article 'Pourquoi Saint Thomas a critiqué Saint Augustin', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* (1926-1927), 5-127.

⁴¹ Band XIX.

⁴² Cfr. l'investigation de Baeumker sur ce thème et sur cet auteur: «Die Stellung des Alfred von Sareshel (Alfredus Angelicus) und seiner Schrift *De motu cordis* in der Wissenschaft des beginnenden 13. Jahrhunderts», dans *Sitzungsberichten der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1913). L'importance de cet auteur n'apparaît pas seulement en philosophie et en théologie, mais aussi dans la science de la nature et la médecine du moment. Voir aussi le travail de Auguste Pelzer, 'Une source inconnue de Roger Bacon. Alfred de Sareshel, commentateur des Météorologiques d'Aristote', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* (Florence: Quaracchi, 1919), f12, Fasc. 1-2.

⁴³ Band XXIV.

Mérite d'être mentionnée aussi l'investigation que Baeumker écrivit sur le traducteur tolédan dont nous avons parlé et dont il s'était tant servi, Dominicus Gundissalinus: «Les écrits philosophiques de Dominicus Gundissalinus»⁴⁴. Cette étude a donné le ton décisif pour les analyses postérieures du labeur de Domingo Gundisalvo comme philosophe et comme traducteur. Depuis l'inspiration de Baeumker, se publièrent dans les *Beiträge* les œuvres suivantes de l'auteur espagnol du XII^e siècle: *De unitate et uno*, par P. Correns⁴⁵; *De immortalitate animae*⁴⁶ et *De processione mundi*⁴⁷, par G. Bülow; et le *De divisione philosophiae*, par L. Baur⁴⁸.

L'œuvre de Dominicus Gundissalinus apporta –explique bien Baeumker– des thèses fondamentales de philosophes qui marquèrent à leur tour le rythme spéculatif du Moyen Âge. Ibn Gabirol est une des sources d'inspiration les plus importantes dans le *De processione mundi*. Avicenne apparaît dans cette dernière œuvre et dans le *De immortalitate animae*; Boèce dans le *De unitate et uno*; Cicéron et Isidore de Séville dans le *De divisione philosophiae*, etc.⁴⁹. De plus, les démonstrations de l'immortalité de l'âme humaine, l'explication de l'unité métaphysique concernant tout composé substantiel, en tant dépendante de l'unité première –thème spécialement cher à Baeumker et traité dans les principaux courants du néoplatonisme médiéval–, l'explication de la création, font de Dominicus Gundissalinus une source de référence obligée pour le début de l'étude de la pensée du XIII^e siècle⁵⁰.

De même sous sa direction parut en 1923 l'édition suivante de Augustinus Daniels dans les *Beiträge: Eine lateinische Rechtfertigungsschrift des Meister Eckhart*, avec une introduction de Baeumker. Il écrivit aussi une longue série d'articles d'investigation sur Alfredus de Sareshel, Alanus de Lille, Le «Livre des XXIX philosophes», etc.; et ne laissa pas de côté non plus de précieuses études sur des auteurs modernes, comme Locke, Bruno, Descartes, Spinoza, Rousseau, etc. Ont été rappelées aussi ses synthèses historiques, comme: *Geschichte des patristischen Philosophie* et *Die christliche Philosophie des Mittelalters*⁵¹.

Les contributions de Clemens Baeumker à l'édification de la pensée médiévale, tant dans le domaine de l'édition que dans celui de l'investigation, ne demeurent pas circonscrites dans le compte rendu ici effectué; or, étant donné qu'il n'est pas possible de se référer dans cet article à la totalité des articles d'investigation et des monographies de l'auteur qui fait l'objet de notre présente étude, puisse cet exposé suffire pour apprécier l'importance de sa contribution au médiévisme⁵².

De manière générale, les principaux apports de Clemens Baeumker à l'investigation de l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale, peuvent être résumés dans quatre points suivants⁵³:

⁴⁴ In *Revue Thomiste* (1895), 723-745; postérieurement paru comme: «Dominicus Gundissalinus als philosophischer Schriftsteller», *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, XXV, Heft 1/2 (1927), pp. 255-275.

⁴⁵ Band I, Heft 3, 1891.

⁴⁶ Band II, Heft 3, 1897.

⁴⁷ Band XXIV, Heft 3, 1925.

⁴⁸ Band IV, 1903.

⁴⁹ Cfr. Cl. Baeumker, 'Dominicus Gundissalinus als philosophischer Schriftsteller', *op. cit.*, pp. 260-265.

⁵⁰ Cfr. Cl. Baeumker, pp. 266, ss.

⁵¹ Cfr. F. Van Steenberghen, pp. 284-285.

⁵² Nous remettons le lecteur au travail de M. Grabmann, déjà cité à maintes reprises et qui a servi d'appui pour ce travail, 'Cl. Baeumker und die Erforschung der Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie'.

⁵³ Selon ce qui a été exposé par F. Van Steenberghen, dans son *Introduction à l'étude de la Philosophie Médiévale*, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

Il a signalé avec clarté les liens qui unissent la philosophie scolastique à la civilisation médiévale dans son ensemble.

Il a mis en relief l'influence du platonisme et du néoplatonisme sur la pensée médiévale.

Il fut le premier à se rendre compte de l'importance des Facultés d'Arts dans le développement de la philosophie à partir du XIII^e siècle.

Il promut l'idée de « patrimoine scolastique » (*Gemeingut der Scholastik*). Par-delà les divergences qui opposent les écoles entre elles, l'unité qui fonde la pensée scolastique, comme la présence d'un patrimoine de doctrines, qui vont s'enrichissant de façon progressive, jusqu'à la fin du XIII^e siècle⁵⁴.

En effectuant des investigations sur l'un ou l'autre de ces aspects, Clemens Baeumker fait ressortir tout au long de son œuvre les contours des traits caractéristiques de la scolastique médiévale; et cela d'une façon qui combine à la fois l'originalité et la fidélité à la réalité. L'on peut affirmer qu'il est le premier investigateur qui offre à l'aube du XX^e siècle les traits philosophiques fondamentaux de la *Weltanschauung* médiévale.

Le platonisme au Moyen Âge

Dans ses études sur la philosophie médiévale, Clemens Baeumker a mis en exergue l'évidente influence du platonisme et du néoplatonisme au long de la pensée du Moyen Âge. Dans ce domaine, il apparaît comme l'un des pionniers en ce qui concerne le démantèlement de l'interprétation du Moyen Âge latin comme dominé par l'autorité d'Aristote⁵⁵. En face de celle-ci se présenterait le platonisme de la Renaissance, avec ses multiples et intuitives conceptions du monde, s'affrontant aux concepts établis dans la scolastique; ce fait supposerait la naissance de la modernité. Notre auteur a questionné cette thèse dans deux articles d'importance capitale pour l'investigation postérieure du platonisme médiévale: « Der Platonismus im Mittelalter », écrit en 1916, et « Mittelalterlicher und Renaissance-Platonismus », de 1917⁵⁶. Nous exposerons par la suite les idées et les clefs fondamentales défendues et exposées par Baeumker dans ces travaux.

Normalement, écrivait Baeumker en 1916, on a donné le nom de « scolastique » à la philosophie qui utilisait la pensée d'Aristote comme instrument pour l'éclaircissement du dogme; et ainsi l'on a coutume d'opposer une scolastique aristotélicienne médiévale au platonisme de la Renaissance, le platonisme humaniste,

⁵⁴ Baeumker lui-même exposa sa vision et ses apports à la philosophie médiévale, dans l'autobiographie qu'il publia dans la collection: *Die deutsche Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, sous le titre « Clemens Baeumker » (Leipzig : Meiner, 1921), II, pp. 31-60; il y offre même une liste bibliographique presque complète de ses investigations, études et travaux publiés.

⁵⁵ Certes, la thèse que nous reprenons dans ce paragraphe, constitue de nos jours une hypothèse de base au moment d'effectuer des investigations sur un quelconque courant de pensée médiéval; elle n'était pas cependant chose si évidente à l'aube du siècle passé. Une des plus récentes publications en castillan, de nos jours, qui reprend les principaux apports du néoplatonisme à l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale et de l'histoire de la philosophie en général, est la suivante: *Revisión del Neoplatonismo*, éd. de M. J. Soto Bruna, dans *Anuario Filosófico*, 33, I-II (2000). S'y rassemblent—d'entre autres—investigations de W. Beierwaltes, M. Cruz Hernández, G. Reale, etc.

⁵⁶ Les deux sont recueillis dans le volume mentionné de l'hommage à l'auteur: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (1927) pp. 139-179 et pp. 180-193, respectivement.

créateur de la culture moderne⁵⁷. Cependant, il ne s'avère guère facile –ni n'équivaut à la réalité de la vie philosophique du Moyen Âge– classer la philosophie médiévale dans le platonisme ou dans l'aristotélisme : il ya déjà longtemps –rappelle Baeumker– que l'on est parvenu à reconnaître que dans la vie intellectuelle du Moyen Âge s'entrecroisent divers courants⁵⁸. A partir de cette observation, sont mis en évidence deux courants qui traversent le Moyen Âge et qui se trouvent inspirés de Platon : le mouvement humaniste et les développements dans la sciences de la nature.

Le mouvement humaniste atteindra son apogée au XII siècle⁵⁹, à travers l'Ecole de Chartres, perdurant au long du XIII siècle⁶⁰. Comme on le sait, l'influence d'Aristote dans cette Ecole se rapporte principalement au domaine de la logique ; tandis que dans des questions strictement philosophiques la source principale est le *Timée* platonique, à travers duquel commentaire s'édifie l'humanisme du XII siècle et la science naturel en ce moment.

Adelard de Bath, dans *De eodem et diverso* apparaît –de la main de Baeumker– comme un des auteurs platoniciens les plus importants du moment et très en rapport avec l'Ecole de Chartres. Les deux principes de toutes les choses sont l'« identique » et le « diverse », cherchant ainsi à expliquer le rapport entre l'intelligible et le sensible⁶¹. Dans la même ligne, sont mentionnés Bernard de Chartres et Bernard de Tours (« Sylvester »), notamment leur œuvre *De mundi universitate* et leur renouvellement de la théorie platonicienne des idées⁶². De la même manière, note Baeumker, que Thierry de Chartres explique l'œuvre de la création en six jours selon l'esprit du *Timée*. Le Nous divin apparaît comme conformant le grand et le petit dans le monde selon le modèle des idées divines ; exposant une vision du

⁵⁷ Cl. Baeumker, « Der Platonismus im Mittelalter », p. 140.

⁵⁸ A la page 144 (note 16) de l'article que nous commentons, Clemens Baeumker se réfère à l'œuvre de Georg Freiherr v. Hertling, 'Wissenschaftliche Richtungen und philosophische Probleme in dreizehnten Jahrhundert', in J. A. Endres, ed., *Historische Beiträge zur Philosophie* (Kempten u. München: Kösel, 1914), pp. 152-180.

⁵⁹ Au IX siècle déjà Jean Scot Érigène, se référant au *Timée*, loua Platon comme le plus grands parmi les philosophes qui ont pensé au sujet de la constitution du monde. Cl. Baeumker se réfère dans la p.147 (note 18) au *De divisione naturae*, I, 31 (PL, 122, 476 C) : « Plato siquidem, philosophantium de mundo maximus, in suo Timaeo asserit ... ».

⁶⁰ A la page 145 (note 17) de l'article sur lequel s'effectue notre présente réflexion, Baeumker signale avec pertinence les plus importants livres et articles écrits jusqu' alors sur le platonisme médiéval. A mon avis, les œuvres citées constituent ce que nous pourrions dénommer une sorte d'« histoire du platonisme au Moyen Âge ». Parmi celles citées par Baeumker, nous pouvons relever : Charles Huit, 'Le platonisme au Moyen Âge, *Annales de philosophie chrétienne*, Nouv. Sér., 20-22 (Paris 1889-1890) (vol. XX: 31-47, 324-333, 417-514 ; vol. XXI: 160-184, 281-293, 371-382, 455-478 ; vol. XXII: 26-47) ; Leopold Gaul, *Alberts des Grossen Verhältnis zu Plato. Eine literarische und philosophiegeschichtliche Untersuchung*, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Band XII, Heft 1, Münster, 1913 ; l'œuvre de Cl. Baeumker lui-même, déjà citée, sur Witelo, et longuement évoquée dans : M. Grabmann, 'Der Neuplatonismus in der deutschen Hochscholastik', *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, 23 (1910), pp. 38-54.

⁶¹ Adelardus Bathensis, *De eodem et diverso*, ed. de Hans Willner dans *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Band IV, Heft 1, Münster (1893) (cit. par Cl. Baeumker dans la note 20 de la page 147, dans son article « Der Platonismus im Mittelalter »).

En général, le platonisme chartrain fut très bien expliqué, selon Baeumker par A. Stöckl, dans le premier volume de son *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, déjà citée.

⁶² E. Gilson, 'Le platonisme de Bernard Chartres', *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie* (1923), pp. 5-19.

monde dans laquelle règne l'harmonie dans la diversité⁶³; ainsi commence aussi, et suivant l'inspiration de la seconde partie du dialogue platonicien le *Timée*, l'intérêt pour l'investigation du monde sensible. Tel serait –dans la thèse que nous exposons de Baeumker– le début du mouvement relatif aux sciences naturelles, qui, en union avec la science arabe, reçoit ici son premier élan⁶⁴.

Ainsi donc, ce que Clemens Baeumker a dénommé «mouvement scientifique» du Moyen Âge, se meut dans le même plan des idées que celui précédemment mentionné «mouvement humaniste». Dans ce domaine, ce serait l'orientation donnée dans le platonisme à la science mathématique qui prévaudrait sur Aristote lorsqu'il est question d'expliquer le cosmos, en sus de l'adoption des connaissances de la science arabe.

Trois doctrines fondamentales du néoplatonisme sont adoptées dans ces courants du Moyen Âge: la théorie de l'émanation, la métaphysique de la lumière et la représentation stoïco-néoplatonicienne d'un monde en harmonie⁶⁵. Selon ces représentations, le premier principe de tout être et de toute la réalité irradie de sa plénitude une force. Ceci ne se produit point selon un déploiement substantiel de son essence, mais à travers une dynamique irradiation de sa propre force, qui maintient son autosuffisance. De cette irradiation provient l'âme du monde, d'où surgit la nature: d'abord, à partir des intelligences du monde supra lunaire, ensuite l'âme humaine et, enfin, le monde sensible⁶⁶. Cette vision du monde sera adoptée –fait remarquer Baeumker–, au moins en ses traits fondamentaux, par la ligne philosophique que l'on parcourt de Giordano Bruno à l'idéalisme allemand⁶⁷.

Au XIII^e siècle, subsistera –selon Baeumker– le platonisme augustinien chez Thomas d'Aquin. Bien qu'à ses yeux, Thomas d'Aquin n'aurait pas accepté dans sa littéralité une des doctrines fondamentales du néoplatonisme originaire, à savoir, la théorie de l'émanation. Ainsi donc, la thèse dionysienne selon laquelle le Bien est diffusif par et à partir de soi-même, aurait été interprétée par Thomas d'Aquin, non pas dans le sens de la cause efficiente, mais uniquement dans le sens de la cause finale⁶⁸. Bien que les doctrines sur la hiérarchie des causes et sur la participation de l'être dans les étants créés; la thèse de la primauté de l'unité sur la multiplicité, et, même, la doctrine gnoséologique du fondement éternel de la vérité: sont tous des principes de racine platonicienne très présents au long de toute l'œuvre de Thomas d'Aquin.

⁶³ Cfr. P. Duhem, 'Thierry de Chartres et Nicolas de Cues', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (1909), pp. 525-531 ; E. Jeanneau, 'Simples notes sur la cosmogonie de Thierry de Chartres', *Sophia*, 23 (1955), pp. 172-183.

⁶⁴ Cfr. sur ce point: Alexandre Koyré, *Estudios de pensamiento científico* (Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1997), pp. 22-23 y pp. 184-186.

⁶⁵ Bien sûr, apprécie Baeumker, l'on ne guère oublier la connaissance de Procle et de Plotin au XII^e siècle, et notamment à travers les idées transmises dans les écrits : *Liber de causis* et celle reçue comme *Théologie d'Aristote*; cfr. pp. 154-160 de l'article 'Der Platonismus im Mittelalter'.

⁶⁶ Cfr. Cl. Baeumker, 'Der Platonismus im Mittelalter', p. 161.

⁶⁷ Cfr. Les thèses fondamentales de la métaphysique et de la cosmogonie de Giordano Bruno et leur rapport avec l'idéalisme schellinguien (ou schellinien): M. J. Soto-Bruna, *La metafísica del infinito en Giordano Bruno* (Pamplona: Cuadernos de Anuario Filosófico, Serie Universitaria n° 127, Ediciones de la Universidad de Navarra, 1997).

⁶⁸) Cfr. Cl. Baeumker, 'Der Platonismus im Mittelalter', p. 172, et note 81. Thomas d'Aquin, *S Th I*, q. 5 a. 4 ad 2: "Ad secundum dicendum quod bonum diffusivum sui esse, eo modo quo finis dicitur movere".

Au XIII siècle aussi, l'oeuvre bonaventurienne, *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, exprime les traits fondamentaux de la métaphysique néoplatonicienne de la lumière et sa doctrine des idées⁶⁹. Celui-ci constitue un antécédent pour le courant de la mystique allemande qui possédera en M. Eckhart un de ses plus grands représentants⁷⁰.

Sans aucun doute, c'est dans son édition et investigation sur Witelo, où Clemens Baeumker aborde d'une manière plus complète le courant néoplatonicien de pensée au Moyen Âge. Le volume des *Beiträge* consacré à cet auteur du XIII siècle⁷¹ a supposé un modèle pour l'édition critique des textes médiévaux⁷². La supposition consistant à considérer Witelo comme ayant été l'auteur du livre: *De intelligentiis*, se base sur l'étude minutieuse des manuscrits et sur la comparaison des thèses soutenues dans celle-ci (ou dans ladite étude) et dans le *De perspectiva*; les deux traités exposent les lignes fondamentales de la métaphysique néoplatonicienne de la lumière ; à partir de celle-ci se démontre l'existence de Dieu, l'ordre de l'univers, la composition métaphysique de l'étant infini, et l'on acquiert les clefs fondamentales pour l'élaboration d'une théorie de la connaissance.

Pourtant, Baeumker lui-même, en 1924⁷³, émit un doute au sujet de l'auteur de cet anonyme –selon quatre des six manuscrits consultés– du XIII siècle; de nos jours, il est réfuté d'une manière générale que Witelo soit l'auteur de ce traité⁷⁴. Demeure pourtant le fait qu'il s'agit d'un des livres qui a le plus influé sur le XIII siècle et qui transmet les clefs de la philosophie néoplatonicienne telle et comment elle est recueillie au Moyen Âge⁷⁵. Puisque, en tout cas, l'édition de Baeumker établit d'une manière définitive le texte critique, et suppose une des meilleures investigations sur le courant platonicien évoqué.

Le traité *De intelligentiis* (qui est intitulatur *memoriale rerum difficilium*⁷⁶) –clairement inspiré dans le *Liber de Causis* et la correspondante cosmovision de Procle –com-

⁶⁹ Cfr. Cl. Baeumker, 'Der Platonismus im Mittelalter', pp. 175-179.

⁷⁰ Cfr. Raymond Klibansky, *The Continuity of Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages. Outline of a Corpus Platonium Medii Aevi* (Londres: 1939) (2^e ed.: 1950).

⁷¹ Cl. Baeumker, *Witelo, ein Philosoph und Naturforscher des XIII. Jahrhunderts*, en *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1908), Band III, Heft 2. L'édition suppose que l'on considère Witelo comme l'auteur du livre *De intelligentiis*, ayant examiné; six manuscrits (pp. IX-XXII et pp. 1-126); édite au surplus une partie importante du *De perspectiva* (pp. 127-179); les investigations de Baeumker occupent le reste des 686 pages qui composent ce volume.

⁷² Ainsi l'expose M. Grabmann dans son article, déjà cité: 'Der Neoplatonismus in der deutschen Hochscholastik', p. 39 où il affirme que Baeumker a utilisé les techniques modernes de l'édition pour des textes médiévaux que Otto Stählin enseigna dans son investigation sur ce sujet: 'Editionstechnik. Ratschläge für die Anlage textkritischer Ausgaben', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, I (1909) pp. 393-433.

⁷³ Cfr. Cl. Baeumker, 'Zur Frage nach Abfassungszeit und Verfasser des irrtümlich Witelo zugeschriebenen *Liber de intelligentiis*', dans *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle* (Roma : Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1924), Vol. I, pp. 87-202.

⁷⁴ Cfr. P. Duhem, V, 370-375; l'on peut consulter l'actuel *Dictionnaire du Moyen Âge*, publ. sous la dir. de Cl. Gauvard, A. De Libera, M. Zink (Paris : P.U.F., 2002): «Adam Bellefemme (Adam Pulchrae Mulieris)», où apparaît probable l'attribution à cet auteur du traité sur lequel s'effectue notre présente réflexion, suivant surtout les investigations de P. Glorieux, comme: «Les années 1242-1277 à la faculté de théologie de Paris», *Recherche de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 29 (1962), pp. 234-249; 'Maître Adam', *Recherche de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 34 (1967), pp. 262-270.

⁷⁵ Thomas d'Aquin le cite en plusieurs lieux, par exemple: *De veritate*, q. 2 a. 1, s. c. 3; *Quodlibetales*, VI, q. 11, s. c.

⁷⁶ Cl. Baeumker, *Witelo*, ed. cit., 'Kritische Anklang', p. 1 et p. 73.

mence avec la démonstration d'une première cause dans la série des causes: *Si est causam et causatum ponere, necesse est causam primam esse*⁷⁷; pour appliquer ensuite la thèse néoplatonicienne qui met l'unité comme principe de la multiplicité, et la réduction y relative du multiple à l'un. Déjà la troisième proposition du livre évoque la prééminence du parfait sur l'imparfait dans n'importe quel genre, citant en ce moment la *Métaphysique* d'Aristote⁷⁸; et, dans la quatrième proposition on affirme l'existence d'une première cause intelligible, universelle, premier principe de toutes les choses, *causa per se*, auquel se réduisent les *causae per accidens*. Cette première cause est caractérisée principalement et essentiellement comme substance et comme lumière, de la nature de laquelle participent tous les autres êtres: *Prima substantiarum est lux. Ex quo sequitur naturam lucis participare alia*⁷⁹.

L'on développe par la suite la doctrine de la participation des êtres finis dans le premier principe, à la nature duquel appartient leur disposition à se diffuser ou à se multiplier sans rien perdre de leur essence: *Lucis proprietatis sunt simplicitas et sui multiplicatio*⁸⁰. Ainsi donc, la hiérarchie des étants s'établit selon le degré de participation à la lumière divine: *Unumquodque quantum habet de luce, tantum retinet esse divini*⁸¹; *Unaquaeque enim substantia in ordine universi magis habens de luce quam alia dicitur nobilior ipsa; nobilior vero in omnibus attenditur secundum appropinquationem maiorem et participationem esse divini*⁸². Et la même connaissance est expliquée à partir de la lumière comme principe.

À partir des hypothèses ébauchées, le platonisme de la Renaissance ne doit pas être interprété –aux yeux de Baeumker– comme une rupture radicale avec le Moyen Âge⁸³. La compréhension de ce sujet implique, à ses yeux, que l'on tienne compte du fait que le Platon qui a plus d'incidence sur la Renaissance n'est pas celui des Dialogues, mais celui de Plotin, c'est-à-dire, il s'agit d'un platonisme modifié par le néoplatonisme, notamment à partir de la doctrine de l'émanation⁸⁴.

Pour la cosmovision médiévale, qui accueille le Timée à partir de la traduction de Calcidio, le monde sensible est l'expression visible des idées, la nature étant dans son ensemble une image vivante du Nous divin. De son côté, la doctrine néoplatonicienne de l'émanation se trouve en étroite union avec une métaphysique de la lumière: les deux s'intègrent dans une vision hiérarchique de l'univers, laquelle disparaît dans l'intérêt dont fit montre la Renaissance pour l'étude des phénomènes et des substances des causes.

La longue investigation menée à bon terme par Baeumker s'achève en démontrant bien que le néoplatonisme, le dernier grand courant de pensée hellénique et

⁷⁷ Ed. de Baeumker, Prop. I, p. 1, 20.

⁷⁸ Prop. III, p. 4, 7-9: "Omne incompletum antecedit completum in eodem genere. Plura autem esse omnino completa esse impossibile"; Aristote, *Métaphysique*, XII, 8, 1072 b 30-1073 a 3.

⁷⁹ Prop. VI, p. 8, 6-7.

⁸⁰ Prop. VII, p. 8, 23: «Multiplicatio autem est proprietas lucis, motus enim luminis est secundum expansionem, derivationem et multiplicationem. Propter quod etiam fontis proprietatem habet. In ipsa enim est fons et origo luminis», p. 9, 19.

⁸¹ Prop. VIII, p. 9, 18; p. 10, 20: «Et dico quod lux est perfectio omnium eorum quae sunt in ordine universi».

⁸² Prop. VIII, p. 10, 1-3.

⁸³ Nous faisons le compte rendu par la suite de l'article de Cl. Baeumker, déjà cité, «Mittelalterlicher und Renaissance-Platonismus».

⁸⁴ Cfr. sur ce sujet, M. J. Soto Bruna, 'Presentación', dans *Revisión del Neoplatonismo*, I, 11-28.

qui est florissant jusqu'au VI^e siècle, ne prend pas fin alors; tant s'en faut, survécut à travers sa réception et interprétation au Moyen Âge; reçut ultérieurement une forte stimulation dans le domaine de la mystique, jusqu'à parvenir à imprégner une bonne part de la pensée actuelle.

On peut soutenir en effet qu'avec cette investigation (sienne), Clemens Baeumker se constitue en pionnier des investigations postérieures sur la relation entre le platonisme et le néoplatonisme au long de l'histoire de la philosophie. Grâce à ses études, l'on a pu soutenir avec fermeté de nos jours que «Le néoplatonisme est quelque chose à notre tradition de pensée; interne non seulement, mais évident, dans le sens de son appartenance historique, mais aussi dans le sens, peut-être moins évident, de sa congruence thématique»⁸⁵.

De son côté, W. Beierwaltes publia un article décisif: «Unità e identità come camino del pensiero», où il affirmait que la philosophie platonicienne est demeurée sauvegardée -dans notre histoire de la pensée- dans toute sa complexité, et, en même temps, a été développée dans le néoplatonisme ainsi dénommé; il explique comment, dans cette nouvelle forme, il assume un rôle déterminant, soit pour comprendre la théologie chrétienne, soit pour atteindre l'accomplissement de la conscience moderne, auquel on arrive dans l'idéalisme allemand de Fichte, Schelling et Hegel⁸⁶. Cette mise en relation avec ce qui est passé, diverse, ce qui d'une certaine manière apparaît étrange (ou comme étant étrange), avec des problématiques postérieures ou actuelles de la philosophie -affirmait alors W. Beierwaltes- devient possible (ou est rendue possible ou est possible) par le biais d'une «appropriation critique», et en même temps productive d'une pensée qui peut apparaître étrangère à première vue. Ceci, concluait le penseur allemand, constitue l'unique moyen pour arracher à l'oubli la possible présence du passé et pour cela aussi les dimensions et la signification qu'il peut assumer pour la pensée contemporaine.

Ce thème s'intègre au surplus dans un ample champ d'investigation qui a atteint son apogée dans les dernières trente ou quarante années. Le noyau le plus important des études à cet égard a été centré (ou s'est centré) dans l'Ecole de Tübingen, il y a lieu de mettre en exergue H. J. Krämer et G. Reale lui-même. Les conséquences des analyses qui ont été menées à bonne fin à ce égard s'étendent à l'entière histoire de la philosophie ainsi aux différents champs de spécialisation dans le même savoir philosophique. De manière que prenant en compte les résultats de ses études on peut, et d'une certaine manière on doit, projeter de nouveau beaucoup des conclusions établies dans l'histoire de la pensée; et cette réorganisation comprend aussi bien Platon que Adorno ou Gadamer.

Bien sûr, la question par laquelle l'on commença ces investigations se centre dans une prise de position en rapport avec la philosophie de Platon. Et ce que l'on a voulu démontrer est que une interprétation de Platon basée uniquement dans les Dialogues est entièrement unilatérale. De manière que il faudrait prendre en compte la doctrine transmise et non écrite, pour comprendre le système axiomatique sur lequel repose ce que nous considérons aujourd'hui comme la «métaphysique de Platon». H. J. Krämer a résumé l'état de cette question dans son livre *La nuova immagine di Platone* (Napoli, Bibliopolis, 1986).

⁸⁵ C'est le philosophe le italien M. Olivetti qui écrivait cela dans son article «L'Uno e l'altro», publié dans le volume 'L'uno e i molti', *Vita e pensiero* (Milano : 1990), pp. 63-64.

⁸⁶ Cfr. Werner Beierwaltes, 'Unità e identità come camino del pensiero', en VV. AA., *L'uno e i Molti*, 26.

Caractérisation de la philosophie médiévale⁸⁷

Après ses éditions, études, investigations et publications, Clemens Baeumker a signalé douze caractéristiques qui définissent l'esprit et la forme de la philosophie médiévale. Comme conclusion à ce travail et aux apports de Baeumker, nous les exposons par la suite schématiquement.

(1) Le Moyen Âge porte en ses débuts le caractère de la réceptivité; et cela dans la mesure où il suppose une appropriation réceptive de la pensée antique et patristique. (2) Dans la mesure où les grands penseurs du Moyen Âge élaborent les (ou leurs) propres synthèses à partir du patrimoine reçu, l'on peut affirmer ici qu'il s'agit d'une pensée basée principalement sur l'autorité; il s'agit notamment de l'autorité de Platon, Aristote et S. Augustin. Bien que ce ne soit pas une passive acceptation du transmis, et cela dans la mesure où ce qui encourage la pensée médiévale ce n'est pas tant l'historicité du savoir passé, que la découverte de la vérité. (3) L'on peut parler alors d'une priorité de la tradition sur la manière de penser autonome qui doit caractériser l'Époque Moderne. Il s'avère intéressant d'observer la permanence de la tradition à travers l'étude de chacune des écoles et de la relation des écoles entre elles. Le fondement de cette estimation de la tradition réside, en plus de la nature réceptive du Moyen Âge, dans le rôle qu'occupe la philosophie à cette époque. Pour le Moyen Âge, en effet, la philosophie ne revêt pas une orientation subjective qu'elle prend dans la modernité; de telle manière que son regard du passé n'est pas le fait de spéculer : il ne le restitue pas sa propre image, mais la réalité d'une histoire à assumer.

On comprend alors que, une fois trouvée la vérité en philosophie, celle-ci doit être continuée. (4) Le rôle de la ratio ne s'avère alors pas superflu ou sans signification face aux auctoritas. Si cela avait été ainsi, le mode de philosopher médiéval n'aurait pas mené à bonne fin une investigation continuée; bien au contraire, les différents auteurs se seraient limités à une activité purement didactique, de transmission⁸⁸. (5) Le dépassement ou le développement des éléments traditionnels au Moyen Âge se trouve en consonance avec le mouvement scolaire (*Schulmässige Betriebe*) qui domine le Moyen Âge; un temps pendant lequel la communauté prime sur l'individu: il est logique que l'École prenne une grande signification. (6) La formation de nouveaux concepts: une nouvelle terminologie va se constituer au long de tout le Moyen Âge et de ses diverses modes d'expression. (7) L'autorité de l'École implique un certain intellectualisme dans la spéculation médiévale ; dans le sens où il ne s'agit pas d'un savoir «personnalisé». (8) C'est en plus un savoir avec une forte composante internationale: ni par le langage ni par les intérêts spéculatifs se développe une philosophie de type nationaliste. (9) La philosophie médiévale combine un certain esprit harmonique et de concordance avec une vision critique, qui veut édifier un savoir dans lequel soient contenues la foi et la raison. (10) Il s'élabore une authentique cosmovision médiévale (*mittelalterliche Weltanschauung*), dans laquelle priment les valeurs sociales établies et (11) une perspective transcendante de la vie. La théologie révélée assume ici la spéculation philosophique, offrant

⁸⁷ Pour ce paragraphe, nous tiendrons compte de l'article suivant de Clemens Baeumker: 'Geist und Form der mittelalterlichen Philosophie', dans le volume mentionné de 1927, pp. 58-100.

⁸⁸ Baeumker rappelle dans son article que déjà au XII^e siècle Adelard de Bath écrit que les «modernes» n'auraient rien à dire si les antiques déjà n'avaient tout dit.

dans son unité une vision du naturel et du surnaturel; on ne peut pas pour ce motif élaborer au Moyen Âge une éthique purement philosophique. (12) Finalement, ou la conception médiévale du monde est une conception métaphysique; c'est-à-dire, une conception dans laquelle ne gouverne pas l'observation empirique, mais surgit de l'unité maintenue entre la philosophie et la théologie. La psychologie et l'éthique acquièrent de cette manière même un caractère métaphysique, qu'elles cherchent dans la *lex aeterna* le fondement de toute loi. Dans cette perspective métaphysique, l'on peut soutenir que, malgré les multiples courants existants au Moyen Âge en ce qui concerne la théorie de la connaissance, le réalisme a la primauté, dans le sens de l'admission des premiers principes de l'être et du connaître; primant dans la logique la théorie du syllogisme sur la pensée inductive.

Table chronologique

- 1853. Clemens Baeumker né à Paderborn.
- 1872. Il entama les études de philosophie et de théologie dans l' *Akademie* de Paderborn, et les continua à Münster, où il entreprend par surcroît des études de philologie.
- 1877. *Dissertation*: 'Über des Aristoteles lehre von den äusseren und inneren Sinnvermögen'.
- 1883. Professeur de philosophie à l'Université de Breslau.
- 1890. Il écrit l'oeuvre: *Das Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie* (Münster) (reéd.: Frankfurt, a. M.: 1963).
- 1891. Clemens Baeumker initia –comme fondateur– les "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", organe international pour l'édition des textes médiévaux et études monographiques sur des thèmes et les auteurs centraux de la philosophie de cette époque.
- 1892-1895. Édition du *Avincebrolis (Ibn Gabirol) Fons Vitae, ex arabico in latinum translatus ab Iohanne Hispano et Dominico Gundissalino ex codicibus Parisinis, Amploniano, Columbiano, primum edidit Clemens Baeumker*. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", I, 2-4 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1892-1895).
- 1900. Professeur à l'Université de Bonn.
- 1903. Il obtint l'honneur de remplacer à Windelband à l'Université de Strasbourg.
- 1908. Édition du *Witelo. Ein Philosoph un Naturforscher des 13. Jahrhunderts*. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", III, 2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1908).
- 1918. Recteur à l'Université de Munich.
- 1924. Clemens Baeumker mourut le 7 octobre 1924.

Sélection Bibliographique

1. Livres

- Avincebrolis (Ibn Gabirol) Fons vitae / ex Arabico in Latinum translatus ab Iohanne Hispano et Dominico Gundissalino; ex codicibus Parisinis, Amploniano, Columbino primum edidit Clemens Baeumker*, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", I, 2-4 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1892-1895).
- Die Impossibilia des Siger von Brabant : eine philosophische Streitschrift aus dem XIII. Jahrhundert / zum ersten Male vollständig hrsg. und besprochen von Clemens Baeumker*, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", II, 6 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1898).
- Witelo. Ein Philosoph un Naturforscher des 13. Jahrhunderts, von Clemens Baeumker*, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", III, 2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1908).

- Die Stellung des Alfred von Sareshel (Alfredus Anglicus) und seiner Schrift De motu cordis in der Wissenschaft des beginnenden 13. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Sitzungsberichte der K. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1913).
- Alfarabi, Über den Ursprung der Wissenschaften (De ortu scientiarum): eine mittelalterliche Einleitungsschrift in die philosophischen Wissenschaften, herausgegeben von Clemens Baeumker, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XIX, 3 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1916).*
- Des Alfred von Sareshel (Alfredus Anglicus) Schrift de motu cordis. Zum ersten Male vollständig herausgegeben und mit kritischen und erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen von Clemens Baeumker. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXIII, 1-2 (Doetinchem: Microlibrary St Willibrordsabdij, 2002-2003).*
- Eine lateinische Rechtfertigungsschrift des Meister Eckhart. Mit einem Geleitwort von Clemens Baeumker ; hrg. von P. Augustinus Daniels, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXIII, 5 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1923).*
- Frühmittelalterliche Glossen des angeblichen Jeps zur Isagoge des Porphyrius. Nach der Pariser Handschrift hrsg. von Clemens Baeumker und Bodo Sartorius Freih. Von Waltershausen. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XIV, 1 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1924).*
- Contra Amaurianos: ein anonimer, wahrscheinlich dem Garnerius von Rochefort zugehöriger Traktat gegen die Amalrikaner aus dem Anfang des XIII. Jahrhunderts. Nach dem Handschrift zu Troyes neu herausgegeben von Clemens Baeumker; mit Nachrichten über die übrigen unedierte Werke des Garnerius. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XIV, 5-6 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1926).*
- Magistri Petri de Ybernia Expositio et Quaestiones in librum Aristotelis Peryermeneias seu de interpretatione: (ex cod. Vaticano latino 5988), éd. par Michael Dunne, Determinatio magistralis: (ex cod. Ampl. F. 335), éd. par Clemens Baeumker (Louvain: Éditions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1996).*

2. Articles

- 'Einige Gedanken über Metaphysik und über ihre Entwicklung in der griechischen Philosophie', *Jahresbericht der philosophischen Sektion der Görresgesellschaft* (1884), 67-102.
- 'Handschriftliches zu Alanus', *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (1893 et 1894), 163-175 et 417-424.
- 'Les écrits philosophiques de Dominicus Gundissalinus', *Revue Thomiste*, 5 (1897), 723-745.
- 'Herr Fr. Gundissalv Feldner und mein 'Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie'', *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (1898), 182-189.
- 'Roger Bacon's Naturphilosophie', *Franziskanische studien* (1916), 1-109.
- 'Clemens Baeumker', *Die deutsche Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen* (Leipzig: Meiner, 1921), II, 31-60 (autobiographie).
- 'Erinnerungen an P. Ignatius Jailer. Mit Briefen von P. Ignatius an den Verfasser', *Franziskanische Studien*, 11 (1924), 33-40.
- 'Dominicus Gundissalinus als philosophischer Schriftsteller', "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXV, 1-2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927), 255-275.
- 'Der Platonismus im Mittelalter' (1917), "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXV, 1-2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927), 139-179.
- 'Mittelalterlicher und Renaissance-Platonismus' (1917), "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXV, 1-2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927), 180-193.
- 'Geist und Form der Mittelalterlichen philosophie', "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXV, 1-2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927), 58-100.

3. Publications sur Clemens Baeumker

- Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag Clemens Baeumker, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXV, 1-2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1913).*

Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Festgabe Clemens Baeumker zum 70. Geburtstag, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", Supplementband II (Münster: Aschendorff, 1923).

Martin Grabmann, 'Clemens Baeumker und die erforschung der Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters', "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXV, 1-2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927), 1-40.

Studien und Charakteristiken zur Geschichte der Philosophie, insbesondere des Mittelalters / gesammelte Vorträge und aufsätze von Clemens Baeumker; mit einem Lebensbilde Baeumkers herausgegeben von Martin Grabmann, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters", XXV, 1-2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927).

Ferdinand Van Steenberghen, 'Clemens Baeumker', in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et géographie ecclésiastiques*, éd. par Alfred Baudrillart, Albert Vogt et Urbain Rouzières, vol. 7 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1912-2000, 1931), col. 180-184.

Ferdinand Van Steenberghen, 'Figures de Médiévistes', in Fernand Van Steenberghen, *Introduction à l'étude de la Philosophie Médiévale*, préf. de Georges Van Riet (Louvain: Publications Universitaires/Paris: Béatrices-Nauwelaerts, 1974), pp. 283-333.

Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz, 'Clemens Baeumker', *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon*, I (1990), Spalte 343 (<http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/b/baeumker>).

Pierre Duhem (1861 – 1916)

Michael McVAUGH

(University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill)

I

Pierre Duhem became a medievalist exactly one hundred years ago this year, in December 1903, when he was forty-two years old – until that moment he had merely been one of France's best-known and most productive mathematical physicists. He had been born in Paris (it is ironic that his career would send him away from the capital, not bring him to it) and was sent by his pious mother to a private Catholic school, the Collège Stanislas, where he discovered his aptitude for mathematics and physics¹. Upon graduation, because of his desire to teach, he presented himself as a candidate for the École Normale Supérieure (rather than the École Polytechnique, which would have been another possibility), and placed first in the competition for admission for 1882. Within a few years the young *normalien* was publishing long papers in the school's *Annales scientifiques*, and in 1884 he was permitted to present to the Académie des Sciences a note on what he termed "thermodynamic potential." In the same year he passed examinations for the license in both mathematics and physics, but when he presented his doctoral thesis in 1885 in physics (also on the subject of the thermodynamic potential) it was rejected by the examiners. The young Duhem's developing ideas on thermodynamics had brought him into conflict with two influential members of the Faculté des Sciences in Paris, Gabriel Lippmann and especially Marcelin Berthelot, and Lippmann had been the president of Duhem's examining tribunal. Nevertheless, a version of the rejected thesis was accepted and published by the Parisian firm of A. Hermann et Cie. in 1886, and the thermodynamic potential was again central to the doctoral thesis that Duhem would successfully present – this time in mathematics – in 1888. But Berthelot had already declared that "Ce jeune homme n'enseignera jamais à Paris"².

Duhem was awarded a position at Lille in 1887, even before his second thesis was accepted. He was successful as a teacher there and productive in research, but his strong Catholicism exacerbated anticlerical feeling at the school, and his outspokenness made him an uncomfortable colleague; in 1893 his dean and his rector managed to get him transferred to Rennes. Here he had no students, and rumors spread that he would be brought to Paris, but instead the Ministry of Public Education sent him to Bordeaux in 1895, and there he remained for the rest of his career, blocked by Berthelot and the administration from moving to the capital. Nevertheless, his sympathizers in the scientific community were at least able to bring

¹ The biographical details that follow have been drawn from Stanley L. Jaki, *Uneasy Genius: The Life and Work of Pierre Duhem* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1984).

² The phrase is recorded by Hélène Pierre-Duhem, *Un savant français: Pierre Duhem* (Paris: Plon, 1936), pp. 53 and 146.

about his election as a corresponding member of the Académie des Sciences in 1900; in 1913, near the end of his life, with Berthelot dead, he would be elected a non-resident member.

At Lille and at Bordeaux Duhem continued his research in thermodynamics, in particular his pursuit of a generalized thermodynamics that would encompass all chemistry and physics; he was convinced that classical mechanics was merely a special case of a more general continuum theory. This broader program led him at Bordeaux to write several multi-part works (first published separately as journal articles, then assembled in books) presenting his views: for example, *Le mixte et la combinaison chimique* (1900-01), and *L'évolution de la mécanique* (1903), in both of which he argued his case by looking at the rise of mechanistic theories, and then contrasting them with his own viewpoint. He was drawing on history in his writings, but only to make a point about contemporary physics, and his interest in the past went back only to the time of Galileo and Descartes.

Next in his didactic program Duhem took up the history of statics, where he adopted Leonardo da Vinci as his starting point, assuming that Leonardo had built directly on Aristotle and Archimedes: "the commentaries of the Scholastics . . . added essentially nothing to the ideas of the Stagirite," he wrote in the first part of his *Origines de la statique* (published October 1903); "to see these ideas grow new shoots and yield new fruit," he went on, "we must await the beginning of the sixteenth century"³. He had not yet discovered medieval science. But in December of that year, 1903, a postcard from Paul Tannery drew his attention for the first time to a significant thirteenth-century scholar, Jordanus de Nemore, and to the medieval science of weights⁴; as Duhem began to explore the medieval literature, the successive installments of *Les origines de la statique* began to make more and more claims for medieval writers as having anticipated the ideas of the seventeenth century. Assembled in two volumes in 1905-06, they concluded with an insight that had scarcely occurred to Duhem before, that the development of scientific thought is a continuous process, and is not so much the sudden succession of light upon dark as an "evolution [as he put it] . . . marked by two characteristics: continuity and complexity"⁵. He had been captured for medieval history. He was only forty-five years old – and he had just ten more years to live.

Nevertheless, those ten short years were extraordinarily productive ones. Duhem began by going back to the sources he had just discovered and ransacking them for more evidence of medieval science – again using da Vinci as a point of departure, but this time treating him as a transitional figure in the course of science. Three volumes of *Études sur Léonard de Vinci* appeared one after another in 1906, 1909, and 1913, the first two subtitled tellingly "ceux qu'il a lus et ceux qui l'ont lu". Here for the first time readers had their attention called to the medieval precursors of Galilean kinematics and dynamics, most importantly Jean Buridan and Nicole Oresme, whose works Duhem discovered in manuscript sources and excerpted at length. And when those three volumes had been published (again by Hermann) he began to develop

³ Quoted in R. N. D. Martin, 'The genesis of a mediaeval historian: Pierre Duhem and the origins of statics', *Annals of Science*, 33 (1976), p. 119.

⁴ R. Niall D. Martin, 'Duhem and the origins of statics: Ramifications of the crisis of 1903-1904', *Synthese: International Journal for Epistemology, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, 83 (1990), 340-42.

⁵ Quoted in Jaki, 389.

his theme of scientific continuity through the Middle Ages at still greater length in a work that he entitled, not without a certain ambitiousness, “Le système du monde” – subtitled “histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic”. This work drew together much of what he had gone over in earlier writings, for it dealt with terrestrial physics as well as with cosmology, but he set it in a new perspective shaped by additional sources. Four volumes were in print when he died, and a fifth was in press (it appeared in 1917); but he had drafted five further volumes, and they were finally published (by Hermann, once more) between 1954 and 1959. Between them, the *Études* and the *Système* comprise some seven thousand printed pages. Admittedly Duhem paid little attention to literary style; typically he translated long passages directly from his manuscript sources and left it largely to his readers to interpret them in detail. But even so, and even considering that the *Système* took over essentially unchanged a part of what Duhem had already published in the *Études*, it is an astonishingly impressive achievement for just ten years, and of course it leaves aside his other publications in that period, many of them still in physics.

It is an even more impressive achievement if we reflect on the conditions under which Duhem was working. He had no copiers, no microfilm, no word processors, no felt-tip or ballpoint pens, of course; everything had to be transcribed in pencil or ink. But the libraries in Bordeaux had nothing he wanted to transcribe; he was sensitive to being “a solitary worker in the very poor library of a provincial university”⁶. He was utterly dependent on the manuscripts that he could order from Paris, and the first time he asked to borrow a manuscript from the Bibliothèque Mazarine in late 1903, he was refused; only when the Ministry of Public Instruction was reminded that he was, after all, a corresponding member of the Institut was he able routinely to have Paris manuscripts sent to him at the University Library of Bordeaux⁷. And above all Duhem had no prior interpretation, no pre-existing scholarship, to orient him: everything that he discovered in those years 1905-1915 was new and had to be interpreted for the first time.

II

I implied a moment ago that Duhem’s contribution as a medieval historian was to insist upon the intellectual continuity of the Middle Ages with the Scientific Revolution, but that generalization really needs to be articulated and made more precise: Duhem’s thesis about the role of the Middle Ages has, one might say, three different aspects, each of which had great influence in determining the course of scholarship during the century we have just left⁸. The first of these is his identifi-

⁶ Jaki, 391.

⁷ In the last volume of the *Études* Duhem lists the manuscripts he has consulted in his research: one from the *fonds français* of the Bibliothèque Nationale, eighteen from its *fonds latin* —and just *one* at the Bibliothèque Municipale de Bordeaux.

⁸ Much of what follows depends on the close analysis of John E. Murdoch, ‘Pierre Duhem and the History of Late Medieval Science and Philosophy in the Latin West’, in *Gli studi di filosofia medievale fra otto e novecento*, ed. by Ruedi Imbach and Alfonso Maierù (Roma: Storia e Letteratura, 1991), pp. 253-302, though my purpose is somewhat different from his. I have also found instructive R. N. D. Martin, *Philosophy and History in the Work of a Believing Physicist* (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1991); Jaki (1984); and a number of the articles from the symposium ‘Pierre Duhem: Historian and Philosopher of Science’, in *Synthese: International Journal for Epistemology, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, 83 (1990), 179-453.

cation of and emphasis on certain specific natural-philosophical achievements of the fourteenth century that had challenged and corrected Aristotelian physics and, in so doing, had not merely prepared the way for but had anticipated the accomplishments of the Galilean revolution in mechanics. The most important of these achievements were: an explanation of why projectiles continue in motion when they have left the projector, and of why falling bodies accelerate as they fall; the elaboration of the doctrine of the latitude of forms; and the assertion that void space, a plurality of worlds, and the rotation of the earth – each rejected by Aristotle as impossible – were all philosophically possible.

The second aspect of Duhem's thesis that has shaped much historical discussion is his focus upon the intellectual contributions of medieval Paris, and in particular of three Parisian masters, Jean Buridan, Nicole Oresme, and Albert of Saxony. Duhem was aware of the simultaneous discussion of many of the same subjects across the English Channel by men at Oxford like Thomas Bradwardine and William of Ockham, but his treatment of their work tended to be somewhat dismissive, accusing them of "chicanes" and "roueries," casuistry and verbal tricks⁹. There may have been at work here a subconscious tendency to privilege France over England in this specific realm, but even in thinking about science in his own time Duhem tended to attribute "collectively to individuals of a nation very well-defined characteristics and inclinations."¹⁰ His distinction between the "ample mind" of the English, the "supple mind [*esprit de finesse*]" of the French, and the "geometrical mind" of the Germans, a distinction that he developed in relation to contemporary physics in *La théorie physique: son objet, sa structure* (published in the same year as the first volume of the *Études*)¹¹, is notorious.

But I am inclined to believe that there was something else at work here, too, in his preference for the Parisians, namely a physicist's identification with the close attention paid by Buridan and Oresme to the facts of sense-experience in the thought-experiments they so often propose. For of all scientists at the beginning of the twentieth century (with the possible exception of Ernst Mach), Duhem was the most thoughtful and articulate spokesman for instrumentalism or positivism in the physical sciences: *La théorie physique* argued with great effect that the laws of nature were no more than hypothetical constructs, and that the data of immediate sensation were all that could be treated as real or true. It is thus entirely

⁹ One example out of many: "Cette Scolastique d'Oxford, qui trouvait en tout sujet occasion d'inventer d'étranges sophismes pour le plaisir de les résoudre, de développer des *calculations* aussi nombreuses qu'inutiles, dut singulièrement offusquer, tout d'abord, les maîtres parisiens; ils ne retrouvaient pas là ces discussions, menées, à la vérité, suivant la méthode du *sic et non*, mais sobres, claires, ordonnées, exemptes d'inutiles chicanes et de subtiles roueries, auxquelles les avaient habitués les Jean Buridan, les Nicole Oresme, les Albert de Saxe, les Marsile d'Inghen"; Pierre Duhem, *Études sur Léonard de Vinci*, troisième série, (Paris: Nobeles, 1955), p. 449.

¹⁰ André Goddu, 'Natural Classification: Pierre Duhem's Continuity Thesis and the Resolution of Positivism', in *Historia philosophiae Medii Aevi: Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, ed. by Burkhard Mojsisch and Olaf Pluta (Amsterdam: Grüner, 1991), vol. I, p. 344.

¹¹ The work was first published serially in 1904 and 1905 and then collected in 1906; the English version, *The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954), was translated from the second French edition (1914).

natural that Duhem's approach to history should have been essentially positivistic as well¹².

The final part of Duhem's thesis is his assertion that what made possible the medieval challenge to Aristotle was the condemnation by the bishop of Paris, Étienne Tempier, in 1277, of 219 propositions that henceforth could not be maintained by university scholars: as Duhem claimed in volume II of the *Études sur Léonard de Vinci*, the year 1277 marks "la naissance de la Science moderne"¹³. At a general level, he argued, the bishop's determination to free God's absolute power from any possible constraint by Aristotelian naturalism made it possible for fourteenth-century philosophers to go beyond a narrowly Aristotelian physics and to explore the philosophical consequences that would be entailed by non-Aristotelian starting points, thus liberating physical thought. More concretely, Duhem concluded, the bishop's rejection of particular propositions had led medieval natural philosophers to specific new possibilities that led on to the great discoveries of the fourteenth century. Thus the bishop's condemnation of the proposition (number 49 in the list) "Quod Deus non possit movere celum motu recto" for the supposed reason "quia tunc relinqueret vacuum" meant, in Duhem's eyes, that later philosophers could pursue two non-Aristotelian ideas – that the earth was not fixed in the center of the universe, and that the existence of void space, a vacuum, was possible – and in the long run he could see a Copernican system and a Cartesian space foreshadowed in these new possibilities.

As a devout Catholic, defensive of his church in the anticlerical Third Republic, he could look to the events of 1277 as a vindication of the crucial historical contribution of Christianity to the growth of modern science:

Greek science was shot through with theology [he wrote to a friend in 1911]. Those theological doctrines may have supplied some assumptions that were provisionally useful to natural science and that guided its first steps, but they soon become what leading-strings are for children: shackles. If those shackles had not been broken by the human spirit, it would never have been able to surpass Aristotle in physics, or Ptolemy in astronomy. But what was it exactly that destroyed those shackles? It was Christianity. . . . So if this science of which we are rightly so proud managed to be born, it is only because the Catholic church acted as the midwife¹⁴.

¹² It should be acknowledged that the extent of Duhem's instrumentalism has recently come into question, and that some scholars interpret him as in fact a realist in philosophy of science, though they recognize that his language is not always clear-cut: for a recent example, see Paul Needham, 'Duhem's physicalism', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 29 (1998), 33-62. I find myself most convinced by the interpretation of Ernan MacMullin, 'Duhem's middle way', *Synthese*, 83 (1990), 421-30, who sees Duhem as trying to negotiate between the extremes of realism and positivism, but consistently favoring the latter over the former.

¹³ *Études*, deuxième série, p. 412.

¹⁴ "La science hellène est toute imprégnée de théologie. Si ces doctrines théologiques ont fourni quelques postulats provisoirement utiles à la science de la nature, si elles en ont guidé les premiers pas, elles sont bientôt devenues pour la physique ce que les lisières deviennent pour l'enfant: des entraves. Si l'esprit humain n'avait brisé ces entraves, il n'aurait pu en physique dépasser Aristote, ni Ptolémée en astronomie. Or, ces entraves, qui les a rompues? Le Christianisme. . . . Si donc cette science, dont nous sommes si légitimement fiers, a pu voir le jour, c'est que l'Église catholique en a été l'accoucheuse". Quoted, from a letter to Père Bulliot dated 21 mai 1911, by Hélène Pierre Duhem, *Un savant français*, pp. 165-6, 167.

Duhem was not claiming that the bishop had made concrete contributions to scientific thought in 1277, of course, only that the episcopal pronouncements were what had made it possible for the Parisian scholastics of the next century to break free from the Greeks and establish the basis of modern physics. He must have been deeply gratified to find his most fundamental commitments – to Catholicism, to France, to physics – ratified, in some sense, by his discovery of the science of the later Middle Ages.

III

The interpretation that Pierre Duhem developed in the *Études sur Léonard de Vinci* (and would repeat in the *Système du monde*) has defined the way in which subsequent scholars have structured the subject that he called into being, the history of medieval science, even though many of them have challenged the specific points that he made. The first person seriously to pursue them in detail was Anneliese Maier in her various “Studien zur Naturphilosophie der Spätscholastik”: to name a few, *An der Grenze von Scholastik und Naturwissenschaft* (1943, revised in 1952); *Die Vorläufer Galileis im 14. Jahrhundert* (1949); and *Zwischen Philosophie und Mechanik* (1958). Such titles already make it plain that Maier did not share Duhem’s belief in an unproblematic continuity between the fourteenth and the seventeenth centuries. She agreed that the scholastics laid a foundation for later science by developing concepts and assumptions that the seventeenth century took as a point of departure, but she took pains to locate those early developments within their broader intellectual context, on the basis of manuscript studies carried out in the Vatican Library, and by doing so she underlined their essential dissimilarity with classical mechanics. Jean Buridan’s concept of impetus, for example, which Duhem had tended to identify with Galilean inertia, was for Maier still an Aristotelian entity, for it still entailed thinking of motion as something that required a constant force in order to continue. She called attention to a number of other developments in fourteenth-century natural philosophy that Duhem had not pursued very far and that did not point in the direction of the Scientific Revolution: questions about *maxima* and *minima*, for example, and about the concept of a mixture. Still, it remains true that Maier gave most of her attention to the very achievements that had so attracted Duhem, the problems of projectile motion and free fall, and the doctrine of latitude of forms, so that if she corrected or modified Duhem’s broad thesis in many ways, she could not escape from the way in which he had formulated the questions he felt historians of medieval science had to confront.

A second influential scholar who reacted critically to Duhem’s arguments was Marshall Clagett, who at the University of Wisconsin between 1947 and 1964 trained a number of historians of medieval science – John Murdoch, Curtis Wilson, Edward Grant – and in doing so effectively created the first generation of that discipline in the United States. Clagett appreciated the force of Maier’s argument against Duhem’s claims for the “modernity” of fourteenth-century Parisian natural philosophy, as well as of her demonstration that English natural philosophers had made greater contributions than Duhem had been willing to admit. He and his students corrected this latter aspect of Duhem’s thesis by calling particular attention to the creative activity of the scholars active at Merton College, Oxford, well before the heyday of Buridan and Oresme, and to the importance of medieval logic to their enter-

prise. Duhem had quoted from Thomas Bradwardine's *Treatise on Proportions* (1328) the relationship now often called "Bradwardine's Law," but he had dismissed it as a purely Aristotelian statement, no more than "the commonest and most clearly stated principle in Peripatetic dynamics"¹⁵; it was left for Clagett's student Lamar Crosby to edit the text and to show (following Maier) the originality of the Law in associating force with acceleration rather than speed¹⁶. Again, the uniform acceleration theorem we have come to call "the mean speed law," which Duhem claimed Nicole Oresme had established with his new graphical methods, Clagett and his school showed to have originated at Oxford (before 1335) in the context of the logical debates that Duhem had spoken of so scornfully¹⁷.

Yet when in 1959 Clagett published his synthetic *Science of Mechanics in the Middle Ages* (dedicating it to two critics of Duhem, Anneliese Maier and Alexandre Koyré), its very title showed how powerful Duhem's thesis continued to be in shaping historical discussion. Constructed around the subdivisions of modern mechanics – statics, kinematics, and dynamics – and in each case juxtaposing texts of the Scientific Revolution with their medieval precursors in order to draw distinctions between them, Clagett's synthesis reinforced the appearance of continuity with the Middle Ages in a way that surely would not have disappointed Duhem. And Clagett's subsequent study of Oresme's *De configurationibus*, the text that first applied a new graphical methodology to the doctrine of latitude of forms, would not have been written if Duhem had not first called attention to the work¹⁸.

The work of yet another of Clagett's students, Edward Grant, demonstrates the continuing vitality of Duhem's ideas in shaping historical interpretation, in this case the idea of the impact of the 1277 condemnations¹⁹. This part of the Duhem thesis was first singled out for serious attack by Alexandre Koyré, who insisted that the specific propositions so dear to Duhem – involving the possibility of the motion of the universe (proposition 49) and of the plurality of worlds (proposition 34) – had had no bearing on the cosmological developments of the fourteenth century²⁰. But

¹⁵ "Le principe le plus communément admis et le plus clairement formulé par la Dynamique péripatéticienne"; Pierre Duhem, *Le système du monde* (Paris: Hermann, 1956), VII, p. 470.

¹⁶ *Thomas of Bradwardine: His Tractatus de Proportionibus*, ed. and tr. by H. Lamar Crosby, Jr. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961).

¹⁷ Curtis Wilson, *William Heytesbury: Medieval Logic and the Rise of Mathematical Physics* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1960).

¹⁸ As Clagett recognized in his preface, where he began his acknowledgements by saying "I am indebted to the early efforts of Pierre Duhem, who first analyzed the text"; Nicole Oresme and the Medieval Geometry of Qualities and Motions (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), p. ix.

¹⁹ Grant has examined the consequences of the 1277 condemnations in a series of publications; the most significant are 'Late Medieval Thought, Copernicus, and the Scientific Revolution', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 23 (1962), 197-220; 'The Condemnation of 1277, God's Absolute Power, and Physical Thought in the Late Middle Ages', *Viator*, 10 (1979), 211-44; 'Science and Theology in the Middle Ages', in *God and Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter between Christianity and Science*, ed. by David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), pp. 49-75; 'The Effect of the Condemnation of 1277', in *Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 537-39; and most recently *The Foundations of Modern Science in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

²⁰ Alexandre Koyré, 'Le vide et l'espace infini au XIV^e siècle', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 17 (1949), 45-91.

Grant's work on medieval views of space and time led him to disagree with Koyré, to offer a more positive assessment of Duhem's claims and indeed a reinterpretation of his final position: Grant concluded that between the *Études* and the *Système* Duhem came to accept that 1277 marked the beginning not so much of modern science as of the demise of the Aristotelian system, and Grant has continued to find fruitful Duhem's realization that the condemnations often conditioned later philosophers "to consider possibilities outside the ken of Aristotelian natural philosophy, and usually in direct conflict with it"²¹. The fourteenth century's increasing appeal to the absolute power of God was encouraged by the condemnations, in Grant's view, leading to the consideration of counterfactual possibilities and to the exploration of their consequences that characterizes the period's tendency to argue *secundum imaginationem* and to emphasize "uncertainty, probability, and possibility" in natural philosophy²². The "thought-experiments" devised by fourteenth-century scholastics created an awareness that a consistent world could be imagined that was unlike the one portrayed by Aristotle²³. Grant has certainly been unwilling to concede the condemnations the revolutionary importance Duhem ascribed to them, but he has made it clear that they did have natural-philosophical and not just theological, consequences: "[they] expanded the horizons of Aristotelian natural philosophers and made medieval natural philosophy more interesting than it would otherwise have been, and even produced a few significant surprises"²⁴.

Thus all the elements of Duhem's thesis – a continuity of thought between medieval and seventeenth-century science; the originality of Parisian scholars, in particular Buridan and Oresme; the condemnations of 1277 as a watershed in natural philosophy – though qualified or criticized, continued to hold and to compel the imagination of historians, and to shape their constructions of medieval science, throughout the twentieth century. That is not Duhem's greatest importance, however, or so it seems to me. For it is due to Duhem that there is now any history of medieval science *at all*, inasmuch as before he wrote, as Grant has remarked, "the expression 'medieval science' . . . was regarded by many scholars as an oxymoron"²⁵. We today who think of ourselves as historians of medieval science owe our identity to him.

It is already clear that in the twenty-first century the history of medieval science will develop in directions that Duhem would never have appreciated, directions that he as a physicist would never have associated with science. Less than ten years after Duhem's death, for example, Charles Haskins began to approach the subject of medieval science from another perspective, studying closely the route by which university masters had acquired Aristotelian science and focusing on the process of the translation of scientific works from Greek and Arabic into Latin. This approach has led scholars to appreciate how medieval science depended on historical accident – the accident of what works were translated, and when, and of how a technical terminology happened to grow up. In such ways we have come to see that science is more than the history of Galilean mechanics, and that it need not be sought only

²¹ Grant (1979), 239.

²² Grant (1962), 220—where, however, he distinguishes this attitude from the search for certainty and exactness that he views as characterizing the Scientific Revolution; and idem (1996), 147-48.

²³ Grant (1996), 196.

²⁴ Grant (1996), 83.

²⁵ Grant (1996), xii.

in the writings of university masters. Whereas Duhem saw medieval science as involving the inevitable discovery of necessary truths, Haskins called attention to its contingent character, and these two approaches continue to characterize its study. Yet however the study of medieval science evolves, it will be impossible ever again to fail to recognize it as an integral part of a continuous history of the study of nature. That is the fundamental legacy of Duhem the medievalist.

IV

I hope I may conclude by recalling an episode from my own history. In the year 1962-63 I carried out a year of post-graduate studies in Paris, studying at the École des Chartes and reading manuscripts on medieval science and medicine in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Every morning I came in from the Porte d'Orléans to the rue des Écoles and made my way up the rue de la Sorbonne, and every morning therefore I passed by the shop window of the publisher Hermann at no. 6, where, as it happens, the ten fat volumes of *Le système du monde* were displayed for sale – for just three years before, in 1959, the manuscript of the final volumes had at last been printed together with a new edition of the first five, at the urging of George Sarton and Duhem's daughter Hélène. From my own mentors at Harvard and Princeton, Marshall Clagett's students Edward Grant and John Murdoch, I had learned of Duhem's work on medieval science, and I desperately wanted to own his books, I suppose as a kind of testimony to the world that I too was committed to the subject he had created. One major obstacle was obvious – my wife and I were living on \$200 a month and I could not afford it – and I did not even think of the problem I would have in carrying eleven kilos of the *Système du monde* back to the United States, along with everything else. Yet somehow I found the money, went into Hermann and came out with the *Système*, and brought the ten volumes proudly back with me to the United States.

When I unpacked them, I discovered a curiously moving thing: nine of the volumes that I had bought were of the reprint edition that Hermann had produced in 1959, but the tenth – volume II – was from the original edition, printed (on heavy glossy stock) while Duhem was still alive, and it had been waiting for me on Hermann's shelves ever since then. I felt then and still feel a quite irrational bond with the author, as though I had picked up that volume straight from him and his publisher in 1914 rather than 1963. Today (as I discovered in March of this year) Hermann has only odd volumes of the *Système* remaining for sale – so it was just as well that I bought it when I did.

Chronology

- 1861. Born in Paris, 9 June.
- 1882. Admitted to École Normale Supérieure.
- 1885. Doctoral thesis rejected in physics.
- 1887. Appointed *maître de conférences* at Lille.
- 1888. Doctoral thesis accepted in mathematics.
- 1893. Appointed *maître de conférences* at Rennes.
- 1894. Appointed *maître de conférences* and then professor (1895) at Bordeaux.
- 1900. Elected corresponding member, Académie des Sciences.
- 1903. *Les origines de la statique* begins to appear (collected in book form 1905-06).
- 1905. *Études sur Léonard de Vinci* begins to appear (collected in book form 1906-1913).
- 1906. Publication of *La théorie physique: son objet et sa structure*.
- 1913. First volume of *Le système du monde* is published.
- 1916. Dies in Cabrespine (Aude), 14 September.

Selected bibliography

1. Books

- Le potentiel thermodynamique et ses applications à la mécanique chimique et à l'étude des phénomènes électriques* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1886; repr. 1895).
- De l'aimantation par influence* (Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1888).
- Leçons sur l'électricité et le magnétisme*, 3 vols (Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1891-1892).
- Introduction à la mécanique chimique* (Paris: George Carré, 1893).
- Traité élémentaire de mécanique chimique fondée sur la thermodynamique*, 4 vols (Paris: A. Hermann, 1897-1899).
- Thermodynamique et chimie: Leçons élémentaires à l'usage des chimistes* (Paris: Hermann, 1902).
- Le mixte et la combinaison chimique. Essai sur l'évolution d'une idée* (Paris: C. Naud, 1902).
- Les théories électriques de J. Clerk Maxwell. Étude historique et critique* (Paris: Hermann, 1902).
- Recherches sur l'hydrodynamique – première série* (Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1903).
- L'évolution de la mécanique* (Paris: A. Joanin, 1903; repr. 1905).
- Recherches sur l'hydrodynamique – seconde série* (Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1904).
- Les origines de la statique*, 2 vols (Paris: A. Hermann, 1905-1906).
- La théorie physique: son objet et sa structure* (Paris: Chevalier & Rivière, 1906 ; 2nd. ed. enlarged 1914).
- Recherches sur l'élasticité* (Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1906).
- Études sur Léonard de Vinci: Ceux qu'il a lus et ceux qui l'ont lu*, première série (Paris: A. Hermann, 1906).
- ΣΩΖΕΙΝ ΤΑ ΦΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΑ, *Essai sur la notion de théorie physique de Platon à Galilée* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1908).
- Un fragment inédit de l'Opus Tertium de Roger Bacon, précédé d'une étude sur ce fragment* (Ad Claras Aquas prope Florentiam: ex typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1909).
- Études sur Léonard de Vinci: Ceux qu'il a lus et ceux qui l'ont lu*, seconde série (Paris: A. Hermann, 1909).
- Le mouvement absolu et le mouvement relatif* (Montligeon, Orne: Imprimerie-librairie de Montligeon, 1909).
- Thermodynamique et chimie. Leçons élémentaires. Seconde édition entièrement refondue et considérablement augmentée* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1910).
- Traité d'énergétique ou thermodynamique générale. Tome I. Conservation de l'énergie. Mécanique rationnelle. Statique générale. Déplacement de l'équilibre. Tome II. Dynamique générale. Conductibilité de la chaleur. Stabilité de l'équilibre* (Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1911).

- Le système du monde. Histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic. Tome I. La cosmologie hellénique* (Paris: Hermann, 1913).
- Etudes sur Léonard de Vinci: Ceux qu'il a lus et ceux qui l'ont lu. Troisième Série. Les précurseurs parisiens de Galilée* (Paris: Hermann, 1913).
- Le système du monde. Tome II. La cosmologie hellénique (suite et fin) – L'astronomie latine au Moyen Age* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1914).
- La théorie physique. Son objet – sa structure, deuxième édition, revue et augmentée* (Paris: Marcel Rivière, 1914).
- Le système du monde. Tome III. L'astronomie latine au Moyen Age (suite)* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1915).
- La science allemande* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1915).
- La chimie, est-elle une science française?* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1916).
- Le système du monde. Tome IV. L'astronomie latine au Moyen Age (fin) – La crue de l'Aristotélisme* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1916).
- Le système du monde. Tome V. La crue de l'Aristotélisme (suite)* (Paris: A. Hermann, 1917).
- Le système du monde. Tome VI. Quatrième partie. Le reflux de l'Aristotélisme. Les condamnations de 1277* (Paris: Hermann, 1954).
- Le système du monde. Tome VII. Cinquième partie. La physique parisienne au XIV^e siècle* (Paris: Hermann, 1956).
- Le système du monde. Tome VIII. Cinquième partie (suite)* (Paris: Hermann, 1958).
- Le système du monde. Tome IX. Cinquième partie (suite)* (Paris: Hermann, 1958).
- Le système du monde. Tome X. Sixième partie. La cosmologie du XV^e siècle. Écoles et universités au XV^e siècle* (Paris: Hermann, 1959).

2. Bibliography about Pierre Duhem

- Hélène Duhem, *Un savant français: Pierre Duhem* (Paris: Plon, 1936).
- R. Niall D. Martin, 'The Genesis of a Mediaeval Historian: Pierre Duhem and the Origins of Statics', *Annals of Science*, 33 (1976), 119-29.
- Stanley L. Jaki, *Uneasy Genius: The Life and Work of Pierre Duhem* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1984).
- Roger Ariew, 'Duhem on Maxwell: A Case-study in the Interrelations of History of Science and Philosophy of Science', *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, 1 (1986), 145-56.
- Paul Brouzeng, *Duhem (1861-1916): science et providence* (Paris: Belin, 1987).
- R. Niall D. Martin, 'Saving Duhem and Galileo: Duhemian Methodology and the Saving of the Phenomena', *History of Science*, 25 (1987), 301-19.
- Anastasios Brenner, *Duhem: science, réalité et apparence: la relation entre philosophie et histoire dans l'oeuvre de Pierre Duhem* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1990).
- Roger Ariew and Peter Barker, 'Pierre Duhem: Historian and Philosopher of Science', *Synthese: International Journal for Epistemology, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, 83 (1990), 179-453.
- John E. Murdoch, 'Pierre Duhem and the History of Late Medieval Science and Philosophy in the Latin West', in *Gli studi di filosofia medievale fra otto e novecento*, ed. by Ruedi Imbach and Alfonso Maierù (Roma: Storia e Letteratura, 1991), 253-302.
- R. Niall D. Martin, *Pierre Duhem: Philosophy and History in the Work of a Believing Physicist* (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1991).

Ramón Menéndez Pidal (1869 – 1968)

Ángel GÓMEZ MORENO

(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Menéndez Pidal's life is inextricably linked with various different locations in Spain, above all in his childhood and youth. These locations have different landscapes as their backdrop, the mountains of Asturias in particular. It was there, surrounded by the natural, traditional and historical beauty of the Picos de Europa' that the vocation of the individual who was to become Spain's outstanding linguist, medievalist and folklore scholar would be forged; this early background fostered his love for that mountain scenery (which he would later transfer to the Guadarrama mountains' via his first summer vacations in the Monastery of El Páular' or his visits to the sierra from Madrid or his home in San Rafael) which would also be experienced by many other intellectuals and artists of the period, who made up a long list of Guadarrama excursion lovers who achieved artistic prominence, first in Carlos de Haes and later in Aureliano de Beruete (both with their debt to Velázquez), and poetic prominence in such inspired writers as Enrique de Mesa. In Madrid we can well imagine the elegant image of Don Ramón in surroundings like the district of San Bernardo, with its Instituto Cardenal Cisneros (recalling his presence in the classroom and that of María Goyri, his wife, via a commemorative plaque), and the old edifice of the Universidad Complutense (at that time known as the Universidad Central), where he studied and later lectured. He particularly frequented the Centro de Estudios Históricos, which until 1931 was housed in a building that has now disappeared at number 26, Calle de Almagro (from the beginning, after its foundation in 1910, it had had its headquarters in the Palacio de Bibliotecas y Museos, taking advantage of the space inherited from the Museo de Ciencias Naturales); from there it moved to the Palacio de Hielo in the Calle Duque de Medinaceli, which after the Civil War was to become the center for the Humanities section of the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. Following its inauguration in 1933, it was to spend no little time housed in the modern Faculty of Philosophy and Letters on the new Moncloa campus.

These and other locations were to mark Don Ramón's existence; nevertheless, his particular Madrid was, first and foremost, that of the district of Chamartín, known until its later expansion as Chamartín de la Rosa. In 1925, when Don Ramón moved to those outskirts of the capital, beyond the Altos del Hipódromo (the old Madrid racetrack, it should be understood, located where the project for the Nuevos Ministerios by the outstanding architect Secundino Zuazo would later be undertaken), he was doing nothing more than seeking the society of people of his own class, for this district and the nearby one of El Viso were the ones commonly sought after by Madrid's professional and intellectual classes, in other words the small middle class of the time.

Hard by Don Ramón's home stood the blocks of hygienic or cheap dwellings for the working class, many of them promoted by the socialist Unión General de Trabajadores (UGT): the housing estates of Los Cármenes, Los Pinares or Los

Rosales. A stroll around this whole area, at present among the most expensive areas in the capital, proves highly instructive: the ground on which Don Ramón's large rambling house stands occupies a space marked off by only two streets: the principal side, to the east, fronts onto the present Calle de Menéndez Pidal, formerly the Cuesta del Zarzal, a name still recalled for the curious passer-by from the white-washed wall of the Menéndez Pidal House-Museum-Seminary; to the north, this wall reaches the modern Calle de Henri Dunant; to the west, the boundary is marked off by a splendid modern building (a Nuevo Mundo block of flats that reflects some of the most interesting elements in Madrid architecture); to the south stood the house, and even today there still stands the property of another celebrated intellectual, José Castillejo Duarte, Professor of Roman Law in the Universidad Central and Secretary of the Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios from its inception in 1907 (Dr. Castillejo was a well-known Republican who went into exile in Great Britain at the end of the Civil War). Fortunately, part of the ground occupied by this property still remains and in all probability it will be preserved complete from now onwards as it has been turned into what a plaque identifies as the Fundación Olivar de Castillejo. This, however, has not been the good fortune of the home of Claudio Sánchez Albornoz, which stood at number 4 in the Cuesta del Zarzal and disappeared a long time ago; a similar fate, although a different one might have been guessed at, befell the home of Dámaso Alonso, which was shamefully and uncereemoniously pulled down in 2001, at one stroke depriving passers-by of the public gardens that protected it from the dense traffic in the Calle Alberto Alcocer. In its place now stands a luxury apartment block of rather dubious taste (how remote now seem the times of the above-mentioned Zuazo or Luis Gutiérrez Soto!). Not even the yellow plaque indicating that the distinguished poet and scholar had lived there until his death with his wife, Eulalia Galvarriato, has survived.

In order to bring this journey through physical space to a close, I should like to add a couple of interesting details: the first is that Don Ramón's large rambling house is surrounded by a magnificent wall that has fallen foul of the scourge of modern Madrid in the form of sprayed-on graffiti. The second is that the property, which cannot be touched thanks to the heritage of the all-powerful Fundación Ramón Areces, can be seen today exactly as it was originally; in fact, it even has the small grove of olive trees alluded to by those who knew Don Ramón when he was alive and had visited him in his home. In the peaceful solitude of this corner of Madrid, in the splendid house with its regionalist echoes crowned by a large, solid, fortified tower in the northern fashion (like the towers in the mansions built by returning emigrants in the place of his birth), it is not hard to imagine Don Ramón at work at his desk or reading at his lectern with his inseparable eyeshade and fly-swatter; we may also imagine him exercising in the garden and toning up his muscles, a daily habit that aided him in putting in such lengthy working days. And this is not all; there is one additional circumstance that I feel compelled to recall for a reason that everyone will immediately understand. This is that Pidal's great-nephew, Professor Álvaro Galmés de Fuentes, lived in the Calle Menéndez Pidal until his death in February, 2003. As everyone will know, it fell to the latter to draft the biographical sketch that has now been passed on to me; in this sense, there is an important loss in this obligatory change of author, as the personal, human and academic knowledge that Professor Galmés had of his uncle invited expectation of a rich and keenly-felt appraisal, one with a far more solid foundation than that of this modest

alternative. Whatever the case, I have drafted these lines in memory of this illustrious Romance scholar linked with the University of Oviedo for many years and, later still, with the Universidad Complutense in Madrid, where until his death he was Emeritus Professor.

My own interest in the figure of this master among masters goes back many years to my childhood, in which my attention was captivated by a stamp issued by the Post Office to commemorate his centenary, a celebration that was shortly to become a posthumous one. If this proved to be my first piece of *Pidaliana*, the last piece that fell into my hands was the rare commemorative medal coined by the Fábrica Nacional de Moneda y Timbre round about the same time; on one side, a head of Don Ramón, ringed by his name; on the other, we find a knight outside the gates of a city (the Cid, perhaps, and perhaps Burgos) and a hexadecasyllable with a marked caesura that one feels, without needing to be familiar with it, must surely be taken from a ballad. Indeed, instead of going for a stanza from the *Cantar de mio Cid* or another from a highborn ballad, the choice fell on the opening stanza (*El arado cantaré, de piezas lo iré formando*) of a ballad without medieval roots, although it is one that extends across the whole of Spain in the realm of oral transmission and is conserved in several late loose-leaf sheets. It is worth recalling its beginning and end, in which its exegetical and admonitory temper are revealed:

*El arado cantaré, de piezas lo iré formando,
y de la pasión de Cristo misterios iré explicando.
El dental es el cimientto donde se forma el arado,
pues tenemos tan buen Dios, amparo de los cristianos.
Las orejeras son dos; Dios las abrió con sus manos
y significan las puerta de la gloria que esperamos,
[...]
Padres, los que tengáis hijos, ya habéis oído el arado:
cuidad de su educación y procurad enseñarlos.*

The choice of this particular stanza is easily explained, as I pointed out at the beginning. The creator of the medal, with full knowledge of the facts, is reflecting on a pre-eminent facet of the great Spanish scholar: that of folklore specialist *avant tout*; in fact, folklore is the common denominator of a large part of the output of a scholar who fully deserves the accolade of polygraph and polymath: (1) as a specialist in linguistics (witness his researches into Sociolinguistics, Linguistic Geography, Dialectology and even Toponymy), (2) as a specialist in literature (concerned with the oral and traditional dimension of ancient Spanish texts, particularly the *Romancero*), (3) as a historian in the broad sense (moving among chronicles that preserve legends and the minstrels that transmit them) or (4) as a historian of culture and ideas (in his determination to paint a precise picture of Spaniards and their literature). Taking everything together, not even this common denominator manages to successfully outline – much less do so broadly – the scope of the work of Menéndez Pidal, a work that is not so much that of a generalist (characterised by a training as broad in scope as superficial in depth) as that of a specialist, who was outstanding in several disciplines at one and the same time. The work that he undertook across these disciplines would alone have won him fame; nevertheless, the surprising thing is that he shone to such a degree in all of them, especially if we consider the poverty of the Spanish libraries of the day in terms of sources for

Romance languages, linguistics or folklore. This poverty can be perceived today from a distance when we engage in the pursuit of erudite works of long ago. Thus, though he might have recourse to his own library, he was compelled to work diligently to find basic materials for his researches, for the postal services of yesteryear were not what they are today, and interlibrary loans had still not developed their services.

Still in the realm of curiosities, and before entering into the issues that most concern those present, I should add that I possess other interesting texts involving Don Ramón and his family: some books with the owner's marks – I refer to the ex-libris of the Marqués de Pidal – which convey us into the library of his great-uncle, the famous José Pedro Pidal, an outstanding figure for his endeavours as a politician and a scholar; and, above all, to the library of his second-uncle Luis Pidal y Mon, who inherited the title from his father. I also possess a copy of the encoded short story published by Joaquín de Entrambasaguas with the title *Entre el padre y el hijo*,¹ in which this vitriolic scholar attacked Menéndez Pidal (in the fiction *Radegundo Martínez Barbón*), his family and his circle of disciples. This particular episode ended in an exchange of blows and a court case involving several celebrated intellectuals. Granted the virulence (and Quevedo-like wit, for he certainly possessed one) with which Entrambasaguas attacked his enemies, and after reading his book *Pérdida de la universidad española*,² no one should pay too much attention to whatever truth that may underlie this attack on Don Ramón and the whole School of Spanish Philology. What the poet and scholar José Luis Cano relates in a diary or series of recently published memoirs makes far more uncomfortable reading: *Los cuadernos de Velintonia. Conversaciones con Vicente Aleixandre*.³ In its pages, we are regaled with stories of the foremost Spanish intellectuals of the 20th century – Don Ramón among them – involved in intrigues in University and Academy circles; we are told briefly of the collision with Joaquín de Entrambasaguas and informed of the supposed ill will with which Don Ramón pursued Antonio Rodríguez-Moñino, whose entry into the *Real Academia* he tried to prevent at all cost. What basically occurred was that one front, made up of poets, clashed with another, composed of professional philologists. Taken all in all, the scene was, as usual, that of a Spain at permanent civil war and in every area of daily life. I cannot avoid reading this gossip for there is always some point of interest in it and it serves to balance out those biographical studies that verge on hagiography; however, the supposed blemishes on Don Ramón's professional career possibly displayed behind the scenes are of no importance to me.

If these tendentious outbursts are true (which in this case reveal an intellectual of a markedly conservative nature), it has to be said that no one is really free from them; in any case, details such as these are of little consequence, for what remains essentially is his scientific research, the only kind that we can evaluate dispassionately. If I have to inquire into the man, I refer first and foremost to the splendid biographical sketch signed by Don Rafael Lapesa (1969); written in a radically different tone, I also draw on the impressive obituary penned by Yakov Malkiel (1970).⁴ If the former piece moves one to the core, delighting the reader with its

¹ *Revista de Literatura*, 1 (1952), 411-418.

² Bilbao: Ed. Libertad, 1938.

³ Madrid: Edición de Alejandro Sanz, Algeciras: Fundación Municipal de Cultura José Luis Cano, 2002.

⁴ Rafael Lapesa, 'Don Ramón Menéndez Pidal (1869-1968)', *Razón y Fe*, 856 (1969), 475-492; later published in *Generaciones y semblanzas de filólogos españoles* (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 1998), 11-36; Yakov Malkiel, "Era omne esencial ...", *Romance Philology*, 23 (1970), 371-411.

exquisitely simple prose, the latter is surprising because its irony and mordacity – which suit Malkiel's part-mannerist, part-majestic English – are unstinting in their praise and do not conceal the admiration that the Berkeley scholar felt for Don Ramón (this is patently obvious in the prologue that Malkiel requested from Pidal for the homage to his deceased wife, in which the former incorporated the facsimile of a letter that the Spanish philologist had written to María Rosa Lida, as can be seen in *Romance Philology*, 17 (1963), 5-8). Were we to allow ourselves to be ensnared by those obscure intra-historical anecdotes, we would be guilty of a crass error and no small injustice, whether it be Don Ramón as the supposed aggressor or Don Ramón as the obvious victim, whether on the part of Entrambasaguas or someone of the standing of Oviedo's Leopoldo Alas, given his deep antipathy for his fellow Asturians, the Pidals (concerning the young Don Ramón, among other pearls of wisdom, Alas had said that he was "impulsive, medieval and half silly"). With this prospect before us, we had better get down to serious business without further delay, although we have in fact been discussing it right from the outset.

Writing a biographical sketch on the man who, in all justice, we must consider to be our leading medievalist means following the paths taken by historical and philological studies in Spain over more than a century; in fact, the path left behind by Menéndez Pidal must be traced down to and beyond the master's death, for it stretches up until now. Coming to full stature at a period of time clearly marked by a Romanticism to which can be applied the prefixes *late*- and *post*-, Don Ramón was also the first great beneficiary of European academic positivism, and this of a fundamentally Germanic tendency. In spite of the fact that a lifetime spanning a century will necessarily involve moments of crisis or sudden change for any biography, in this instance we can speak only of processes of evolution or, if one prefers, of constant revision of an intellectual ideology that revealed itself to be entirely mature long before the illustrious scholar had reached his fortieth year. From here onwards and until his death, Don Ramón trained in his methods and marked with his particular stamp (with a seal that can be summarised in the adjective *Pidalian*) several generations of philologists, who almost unfailingly accepted his postulates in the following three areas:

(A) They continued with the study of texts of his own choice or literary selection, which proved highly beneficial for genres such as epic poetry, although it worked to the detriment of others such as the novel or *cancionero* poetry (the latter escaped danger, where some of its main representatives are concerned, thanks to Menéndez Pelayo's partial vindication in the thirteen volumes of the *Antología de los poetas líricos castellanos*, published between 1890 and 1908).

(B) They accepted his basic ideology, set out in theoretical terms in *Los españoles en la literatura* (1949) and *Los españoles en la historia* (1949), with several recurring ideas of Don Ramón's that had a profound influence on his disciples and impregnated Spanish culture for decades, such as the limited propensity for fantasy among the Spanish people and, as a result, the markedly realistic character of their literature and art.

(C) In part, but only in part, they consecrated his methods of analysis, which were to project both light (where they insisted on a solid early grounding in Historical Grammar, Romance Philology and Institutions, etc.) and shadow (where they categorically separated Latin and the vernacular as tool and goal, as starting off point and conclusion, or when broadly applying their concept of traditionalism

to medieval Spanish literary studies, particularly in the case of early heroic poetry). I say "in part" because Don Ramón's disciples proceeded to narrow the focus of his methods to suit the extent of their own capacities, for the broad spectrum of *Pidalian* researches frequently transcended the Romance field and occasionally strayed into the field of purely comparative studies. On the contrary, the great majority of his direct or indirect disciples limited themselves to continuing his work in Historical Grammar studies or following his footsteps into research into medieval Spanish literature.

With this state of things, Spanish Philology returned to a large degree to the redoubt from which its leading scholar had attempted to extricate it for good. In his impressive obituary, Yakov Malkiel stresses that Menéndez Pidal alone was capable of freeing himself from a "parochial" or "restricted" attitude that at the time was an endemic evil among Spanish philologists, who limited their inquiries to a strictly Peninsular sphere. As Malkiel recalls, the degree of maturity achieved by our philological studies was due to Don Ramón, through his complex-free relationship with the great Romance scholars of the day, among whom the mythical names of Gaston Paris, Alfred Jeanroy, Jean Ducamin, Alfred Morel-Fatio, Joseph Bédier, Mario Schiff, Hugo Schuchardt, Karl Vossler, Pio Rajna, Benedetto Croce and Arturo Farinelli stand out. For the first time, European philological schools opened their intellectual doors to a Spaniard who published in their reviews and discussed problems relating to the French epic, pan-European troubadour verse or particular dialects, with forceful and complex-free arguments. Positive reaction lost no time in setting in, for Pidal's labours, proper to a Romance scholar who knew his calling, were among the causes leading to the singular development in international Hispanic studies as the 20th century advanced. Romance scholars of the time, hitherto attracted almost exclusively by the language and literature of France and Italy, turned their eyes towards the Peninsula and studied its Medieval period as never before. Unfortunately, Don Ramón's example was partly in vain, for with the exception of a few scholars (in particular the great Romance scholar Martín de Riquer), Spanish philologists limited their inquiries to literature in Spanish, rejecting research in Romance or comparative directions in the manner of the master. The reactions in the latter directions took time to manifest themselves, for they really only came about in the last quarter of the 20th century, not long after the death of Menéndez Pidal – a formidable paradox, indeed.

In the remainder of my text I shall conduct a detailed review of the prospect that I have just described in an attempt to evaluate the precise degree to which Don Ramón continues to be present in Spanish Philology studies, and I shall indicate to what extent we have distanced ourselves from his guidelines or where we radically disagree regarding some of his general propositions. I begin with one obvious but inescapable fact: Menéndez Pidal's biography spans an entire century. He was almost a contemporary of another illustrious scholar, one who was almost as long-lived, Manuel Gómez-Moreno. Both men were linked by age, scholarship and a very close relationship that began to be forged in the *Centro de Estudios Históricos* in the University of Madrid and the Royal Academies of the Language and History; for this reason, in the mid-sixties a certain joke went the rounds that I recall out of the respect and admiration that I feel for both men. Some wit, in an allusion to the two scholars, gave them the name of a pop group of the day: the *Dúo Dinámico*. I have no idea whether all that entered the joke inventor's head was the fact that the two

venerable scholars had the same Christian names as a couple of pop singers of the time, Manuel and Ramón, or whether it actually went deeper and he was considering their active and extensive research careers, marked additionally by a formidable precocity. Referring exclusively to Don Ramón, it is only his due to recognise that he excelled from an early age; in fact, his early maturity is the main reason why, soon after he entered his thirties (and after obtaining - in 1889, to be exact, when he reached thirty - a recently created chair known as the Chair of Comparative Latin and Spanish Philology), he had determined for all time his *iter academicum*. We can see the truth of this statement in the following list of chronologically ordered achievements:

(1) His first work dates from 1893, when he was only 24 years old. This was nothing less than a research piece on the *Poema del mio Cid*, with which he competed for a prize from the *Real Academia Española*, which he duly won. From this first piece it is clear to what an extent his life was marked by the Cid legend and the epic poem that narrates it, which at that time was to be found in the private library of an illustrious relative: the aforementioned Marqués de Pidal.

(2) In 1896 appeared his first book, *La leyenda de los siete infantes de Lara*, which marks out conclusively one of his principal areas of research: the Spanish epic and its permanence in the medieval chronicles. This impulse in his work remains one of his leading contributions - considering the impact and mark it left behind it - to historical-philological studies. At the time he was 27 years old.

(3) A genuine best-seller (today such success in print can only surprise us) announced itself in the shape of the *Catálogo de las crónicas generales de España* in 1898, the fruit of his research in the Real Biblioteca, to which he had unlimited access. This alone was an extraordinary circumstance, for this *sancta sanctorum* only ceased to be so considered in 1982, thanks to the generosity of King Juan Carlos I. The reputation for learning that Don Ramón had already achieved caused its doors to be opened to him when he was still a very young scholar. The resulting book, in which he imposed order and names on the jungle of the medieval chronicles marked a guiding principle that with the passing of the years was to come into even sharper relief: one that unites history with the genre of the epic and the *Romancero*.

(4) In the same year his palaeographical edition of the *Cantar de mio Cid* saw the light. This is a starting-off point for any philological research worthy of the name. In it we can discern the philologist adhering to the principles of his trade and the scholar whose purpose is to lay down the necessary foundations for his later research. Don Ramón's theoretical postulates as a linguist, philologist and literary historian are revealed here as fully mature; from this moment onwards we can only speak of a gentle evolution of these postulates and never of abrupt changes or the abandoning of tenets. We find his principles in place for establishing a historical grammar, his technique in using philological conjecture, or fundamental ideas such as the anisosyllabic principle in ancient Spanish verse.

(5) Reaching the end of this selection of early works we come to an 80-page article published in 1899 and entitled *Notas para el romancero del Conde Fernán González*. Here a new step forward is taken in moving from the legend to the ballad, with which he continued to shape one of the cornerstones of his ideology: the traditional character of Spain's literature, which the master discovered was captured by the *Romancero* as nowhere else. Worth recalling is the incident in 1900, on the occasion of his honeymoon, when Don Ramón had an emotional encounter with the

oral tradition of the *Romancero* in Burgo de Osma on hearing a poor woman sing the *Romance de la muerte del príncipe don Juan*.

Along this latter path we encounter the folklore specialist in Menéndez Pidal, the scholar devoted to field work, as his relatives and disciples were to be in the future. His interests in this sense can be better understood if we consider him to be part of a wider family circle: this requires a reference to his brother Juan (who died in 1915), a politician, journalist and folklore specialist, and the author of a very early work on Asturian folklore (*Poesía popular. Colección de los viejos romances que se cantan por los asturianos en la Danza Prima, esfollazas y filandones, recogidos directamente de la boca del pueblo*, 1885); his wife, Doña María, is present and we can find a good number of works by her with a literary and folklore content (such as the varied collection that she later brought together in *De Lope de Vega al Romancero*, 1953, which appeared in book form one year before her death). This love for popular literature or, rather, traditional literature was handed on from her to her son Diego and her nephew Álvaro; it was also passed on from her to Don Ramón's intellectual great-grandchildren, the folklore specialists associated with the *Seminario Menéndez Pidal*; and it even reached those who can be considered Don Ramón's great-great-grandchildren: the students of the *Colegio Estudio*, a private educational centre sponsored by Don Ramón and Doña María's daughter, significantly named Jimena Menéndez-Pidal Goyri. Another child was given a no less revealing name for anyone familiar with the *Siete Infantes de Lara*: Gonzalo (there was also a third child, Ramón, their first-born, who died during a stay in El Paular, aged only four). Alongside the family names we should place at least that of Francisco Giner de los Ríos, for the latter was the father of the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, a genuine stimulus for the *Junta de Ampliación de Estudios* on the one hand and the *Colegio Estudio* on the other. The *Institución*, a private body that began in 1876, encouraged in its students the same love for nature experienced by its founder, who was an assiduous visitor to the Sierra de Guadarrama and the Picos de Europa. To be brief on the subject, I resort to the words of Pérez Villanueva when he states, with reference to the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza*: "Much of his essential way of thinking and a great deal of Menéndez Pidal's social activity have to be seen as rooted in that soil, in addition to many of his intellectual attitudes".⁵

Returning to the biography of our subject, his vocation was displayed as early as the first fruits that grew from it. In order to follow his chosen path and overcome his father's opposition to his studies in the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, he was simultaneously compelled to study Law, a degree course that he was to abandon only after reaching the fifth and final year of study. The young Menéndez Pidal finally succeeded in imposing his will on a father who was determined to have him cultivate a discipline that outwardly promised more rewards; thus, the same story is repeated as happened in the youth of Ovid, St. Augustine or Petrarch - simply one more illustration of the commonplace involving the rebellious saint or scholar, inasmuch as he is determined to follow his vocation at any price. Rebellion can be cited in other senses, for Pidal was not the typically docile student, capable of winning the esteem of all his teachers; on the contrary, he was the restless spirit who clung to a teacher that he admired, like the Arabist Francisco Codera, and shied away

⁵ Joaquín Pérez Villanueva, *Ramón Menéndez Pidal y su tiempo* (with a prologue by Rafael Lapesa), Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1991, p. 183 (translated from the Spanish original).

from those whom he liked less, such as the historian of literature Antonio Sánchez Moguel, who curiously enough directed his doctoral thesis (he was later to become an open opponent of his pupil and the *Centro de Estudios Históricos*). If Sánchez Moguel's name is a surprising one, the subject chosen to obtain his doctor's degree in 1892 was no less so; Don Juan Manuel and medieval storytelling. The reason behind this choice can be hinted at in the fact that the subject matter inevitably compelled him to move into the domains of folklore, into which he had already strayed when only an adolescent (it is worth remembering that his first piece of work was precisely about storytelling: "La peregrinación de un cuento (La compra de los consejos)", published in a local paper, *El Porvenir de Laviana* on August 31st, 1891). It requires much less effort on our part to perceive the influence of another master, Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, a figure who was to crop up at different moments during Pidal's youth, between his university degree studies and his entry into the *Real Academia Española*. Via an indirect route, Menéndez Pidal was to pass on from the Santander-born scholar to Manuel Milá y Fontanals, a writer whom he had had occasion to discover some time before, aged only 17, after reading *De la poesía heroico-popular castellana* (1874), which assisted him in beginning his studies of Asturian ballads. One of the keys to the training of this self-taught intellectual, as Don Ramón liked to consider himself quite frequently, lies in this direct approach to source materials and its leading researchers.

Thus, we again come to the established milestone: the age of 30. At this early age, his authority was such that via a simple three-page note he was able to definitively impose the title of *Libro de Buen Amor* on the Arcipreste de Hita's fascinating *opus*. In 1900 he published his first etymological research work, which saw the light in the highly prestigious *Revue Hispanique*; in the same year he published a critical edition of the *Auto de los Reyes Magos*, a singular work that José Amador de los Ríos had made known in his imposing *Historia crítica de la literatura española* (1861-1865). In 1902 his edition of the *Poema de Yúçuf* was published, a piece of research in which he made manifest his outstanding training in Arabic language and culture thanks to the aforementioned Francisco Codera, the Aragonese *savant* whom he would praise in early notes and future recollections; the master whom Don Ramón would have the honour of welcoming into the Real Academia Española with his speech in reply of 1910. Pidal had entered the illustrious institution himself in 1902 at the age of only 33 and would become its Director in 1926 and subsequently, after an interval marked by the events of the Civil War, from 1947 onwards. Pidal's acceptance speech (of a most surprising nature, given the early career outlined herein) dealt with Tirso de Molina's *El condenado por desconfiado* and it was replied to by his master Don Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo. This is a significant event, revealing the magnificent relationship that existed between them both. All this was possible because two famous classical myths did not repeat themselves: the intellectual father did not devour the son, in the manner of Saturn, nor did the intellectual son murder the father, in the manner of Oedipus. The principle of cultivating the master, along with the care taken over the outstanding pupil, were the principles observed by both men, and the whole scientific community benefited as a result.

Don Ramón had already absorbed the teachings of the Germanic tradition. He had immersed himself in the scientific output of the representatives of the Golden Age of Central European Philology in the second half of the 19th century. He had studied the great German-language scholars, men of the stature of Meyer-Lübke,

Schuchardt, Groeber, Wolf or Hofmann. Thus, in his own research work he found himself perfectly placed to materialise the methods of that proven current of research, which is to be seen in the first mature work in the field of diachronics: the *Manual elemental de gramática histórica española* of 1904. He only brought this work to a final conclusion in 1941, thus turning it into a completely different work from the one originally conceived. Make a particularly careful note of this, for it represents one of the keys to Pidal's methods: anyone who checks Don Ramón's listed publications or via a database will find that he subjected most of them to a continual process of revision. His work therefore fully merits the adjective *outstanding* (and genuinely *dynamic*, if I may be allowed to return to the anecdote mentioned above), not only for its scientific merit but also for the tenacity that can be perceived behind it. In his mature period, now at the height of his powers, Don Ramón would go far beyond the application of this method; in actual fact, not long after he entered his fifties, and from that period onwards, he would continually take issue with Romance scholars everywhere in order to defend his ideas as a historian of the language, a historian of literature and a historian of Hispanic culture.

His great work was undertaken not only in books or extensive articles, but also in notes and reviews that are rich in data and reflection. Contrary to the opinion that book reviewing lends itself especially to new researchers in the field, Don Ramón cultivated this *genre* throughout his life (like other great masters such as Yakov Malkiel, the author of many lengthy, meritorious reviews in *Romance Philology*), although this was particularly true of him during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Another philological monument dates from 1906, another categorical illustration of his *savoir faire*: his edition of the *Estoria de España* by Alfonso X, which he entitled *Primera Crónica General* (if the truth be told, a title somewhat neglected by the critics of today). Meanwhile, Don Ramón had not lost interest in other subjects: his inquiries into the *romancero* directed his attention to the New World and to the Sephardic communities of the *diaspora*. In this field, his learning would gradually mature in several works that first bore fruit in *El Romancero español* (1910) and reached dazzling proportions in a volume published not long afterwards: *El romancero. Teorías e investigaciones* (1927). In addition, Pidal showed the rich harvest to be gleaned by the critical researching of source materials in a country in which the examination of library and museum sources was still largely uncharted territory (in truth, the task has still not been completed today, not even a third part). The result of his efforts is plain to see in his editions of the *Razón de amor con los denuestos del agua y el vino* (1905), the *Elena y María* (1914) or the *Cantar de Roncesvalles* (1917). These were crucial years in his output: from 1908 to 1911 appeared the three volumes of his edition of the *Poema de mio Cid*, and in 1914 the first issue of the *Revista de Filología Española*, a publication that would open its columns to a great deal of his own work (the first being the above-mentioned edition of the *Elena y María* debate) and to others by his disciples.

As Malkiel points out, if Menéndez Pidal had died in that year, aged 45, he would still be one of the greatest scholars, if not the greatest, that Spain has given to Spanish and Romance Philology; yet he was to live for another 54 years. From all we have seen, it need not surprise us that in 1925 Don Ramón received his first homage in three volumes, in which one hundred and thirty specialists from twenty countries significantly participated. From this moment onwards, and practically until his death, Don Ramón never rested from his labours. The milestones in his scientific

output continued; take note of his philological research in *Documentos lingüísticos de España I: Reino de Castilla* (1919); consider his learning in his field studies of the *Romancero*, with a perfectly proven method in "Sobre geografía folklórica. Ensayo de un método" (1920), where he tests himself against over one hundred versions of *Gerineldo* and *La boda estorbada*; we are dazzled by his rich approach on several fronts to the legend of Don Rodrigo in the three volumes of his *Floresta de leyendas heroicas españolas: Rodrigo, el último godo* (1925, 1926 and 1928). There would then appear, in succession, his great contribution to the history of the language in his *Orígenes del español* (1926, with successive revisions) and his impressive historical study *La España del Cid* (1929, revised in 1947 and translated into English in 1934 and into German in 1936-1937), only superseded in popularity by his work as editor of a *Historia de España* by Espasa-Calpe that later, with every justification, came to be called *Historia de España Menéndez Pidal*.

Literary studies were not neglected either, with genuine milestones such as his research into the *Historia troyana en prosa y verso* (1934). If we take a look at his formidable powers as an essayist, to which I shall be returning later, we have two important works that have already been cited: *Los españoles en la literatura* (which first saw the light as "Caracteres primordiales de la literatura española", the first chapter of the *Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas* by Guillermo Díaz-Plaja) and *Los españoles en la historia: cimas y depresiones en la curva de la vida política*, both in 1949. It is really most surprising that Don Ramón, by then in his eighties, could be capable of assimilating the novelty of the *jarchas* in a first-rate publication ("Cantos románicos andalusíes, continuadores de una lírica latina vulgar" of 1951), that he could write so fresh a book as *El Imperio Hispánico y los cinco Reinos, dos épocas en la estructura política de España* (1950) or that he would reinforce his principles of epic traditionalism and the theory of the latent state in his *Reliquias de la poesía épica española* (1951). In 1953 appeared the first volume of his monumental *Romancero tradicional de las lenguas hispánicas (español-portugués-catalán-sefardí)*; however, even more surprising, if possible, is the fact that a man of exactly ninety should have been able to write such a marvellous work for its deliberation, learning and ability to review his previously held theories and those of the scholars who supported individualist theses as *La "Chanson de Roland" y el neotradicionalismo. Orígenes de la épica románica* (1959).

Although the materials belonging to the two volumes of his *Crestomatía del español medieval*, which had been finished off and revised by Rafael Lapesa and María Soledad de Andrés, came out in 1965-1966, they had been gathered together by the great scholar many decades before. His last work, in reality, was an article cum review of Alfred Lord's book *The Singer of Tales* (1960), in which he applauds the work of the oralists while marking the due distance between two different poetic traditions ("Los cantores épicos yugoeslavos y los occidentales. El *Mío Cid* y dos refundiciones primitivas", *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, 1965-1966); one, that of the Balkan bards, based above all on improvisation and the reconstruction of the poem from a formulaic technique; the other, that of the medieval *jongleurs*, based on the principle of the memorisation of the text with a structure different from the original one. Up until that year, Don Ramón had continued revising, enlarging and recasting old research work and making something quite new out of it; nor had he stopped gathering much of it together in order to put it before the public at large, as can be seen by simply taking a look at the Editorial Espasa-

Calpe's Austral collection. Unfortunately, he never completed his two most ambitious projects; a *Historia de la épica española* (at least Diego Catalán and María del Mar Bustos succeeded in publishing its first volume in 1992) and his long-awaited *Historia de la lengua española*, so often interrupted by circumstances and other minor projects. Even in 1966, days before the illness that ended his life declared itself, he wrote to Sánchez Albornoz: "I am very busy with the volumes of the *Historia de España*. I'll soon be rid of them, however, and then get back to my *Historia de la Épica* and my dream, the *Historia de la Lengua*! Dream on, my soul, dream on. For dreaming is recreation".⁶

After such a fertile life as the one I have been describing, the much-revered scholar passed away on November 14, 1968. Can anything be found wanting after such an outstanding career? Perhaps what some, a few perhaps in the interval since the death of the master have mentioned in the occasional conversation: the fact that he displayed a lack of a certain dimension. Don Ramón was certainly a magnificent historian and a very fine analyst of literature in a historical and historical-linguistic key; however, we must admit perforce that we often miss the literary critic, the sensitive reader, the exegete who pays heed to works for aesthetic values that he is able to expound with clarity. As a most revealing anecdote it is worth recalling his publicly acknowledged inability to appreciate García Lorca, in spite of the formidable literary and folklore substrates of the Granada-born poet's work⁷. Of course, there would inevitably be something to find amiss in such a great scholar, although that relative deficiency in his research is partly remedied thanks to the interpretative work of such direct disciples as the two Alonsos, Salinas or Lapesa. Let us review one last ingredient of his work that, as we shall see immediately, proves to be the common denominator of his whole output.

I refer to the problem of Spain, which runs throughout the work of Don Ramón and so many other intellectuals involved with him, between his own master, Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, and his own disciples, Américo Castro and Claudio Sánchez Albornoz. We should keep clear that the issue not only preoccupied the great thinkers of the time, namely Joaquín Costa, Miguel de Unamuno or José Ortega y Gasset, but it also captured the minds of practically the whole of the Spanish intellectual class between the years of the Restoration and those of the late post-war period and continues to no small degree even today. The subject, of course, is the leading one among the recurring themes for the members of the Generation of 1898, as can be seen from a mere glance at the titles of works dating from that time, from the early Ángel Ganivet and an already elderly Azorín (who died fully active at the age of 96). Between them stands Don Ramón, not only in the two essays mentioned above on the idiosyncrasy and literature of the Spanish people but in all his work, in his enthusiastic return to the Medieval period and in his fervent studies of popular culture, literature and language. Don Ramón was one more among many ("To Pedro Laín, a man from ninety-eight", he put on a signed photograph with a background landscape showing the Sierra de Guadarrama), who were preoccupied with the essence of Spain, its history, people and even its geography, a type of sensitivity and analysis that would form the basis of the landscapes with figures of a

⁶ Pérez Villanueva, *Ramón Menéndez Pidal*, p. 496 (translated from the Spanish original).

⁷ Pérez Villanueva, *Ramón Menéndez Pidal*, p. 254-255.

Zuloaga or those reflections of an Ortega y Gasset in which arid Castile is contrasted with “well-ploughed France”.⁸

The celebrated work by Dolores Franco reflects this ideology of Pidal’s well, an ideology in which the basic concepts of race and caste are not missing – on the contrary; to do this she selects not only the two essays mentioned above but also several pages of *La España del Cid*.⁹ We should not be surprised at this, because for Ortega y Gasset, in a review published in *El Sol* on December 5, 1926, even *Orígenes del español* seeks the same purpose because of Pidal’s setting down within himself such fundamental ideas as the traditional and realistic nature of the literary art of the Spanish people (it should be borne in mind as an illustration that his study, *Carácter originario de Castilla*, concluded in 1943, was an amplification of the final chapters of *Orígenes*). If this is the case, it is because Menéndez Pidal, with the aim of illuminating the history of the Spanish language, united the subject with the overall history of Spain; in this way, his *Orígenes* harmonises with *La España del Cid*; the latter with the *Historia de España*; and Espasa-Calpe’s ambitious project with his essays on the Spanish people’s way of being and the essence of their literature or with the two volumes of collected pieces entitled *España y su historia* (1956-1957). If there is any summary of his method and his ideology, without ignoring the above, I invite readers to discover them in *Mis páginas preferidas* (1957).

I trust I may be allowed space for one final observation concerning his disciples, as they represent the last great inheritance left behind by Don Ramón, an intellectual who deliberately ignored hardly anything. He was never the scholar in isolation (from which that commonplace can be observed in his biography that clearly appears in older *vitae*, such as that of Dante written by Boccaccio and entitled *Trattatello in laude di Dante*), but a man of his time who knew how to involve himself in setting down guidelines whenever this was necessary and who took pains to train and then find positions for his disciples in Spain, Europe and America. On this side of things, it should be recalled that Menéndez Pidal involved himself in Spanish education policy, both on the *Junta para Ampliación de Estudios* and, above all, on taking responsibility for the *Centro de Estudios Históricos*; it should not be forgotten either that he acted as Adviser to the Ministry of Education from 1913 and that there were those who believed that he would make an ideal President of the Second Republic (indeed, the newspaper *La Voz* for October 31, 1931, included his name along with those of Besteiro, Lerroux, Ortega and Alcalá Zamora). He was never a radical nor an excessively militant liberal; even so, during the Primo de Rivera dictatorship he defended university autonomy in a letter published in *El Sol* for April 2, 1929. If at any moment he must have felt overwhelmed, this was with the coming of the Civil War, which took him abroad with his daughter and son-in-law, the well-known Zaragoza-born physicist Miguel Ángel Catalán Sañudo. He spent two years in Cuba, a further two in New York (as a Professor in Columbia University); finally, there was a further year in Paris before returning to Spain. After his return, he was neither close to nor distant from the new government, although he did involve himself in all manner of activity related to the Spanish academic world in

⁸ For this question, see Dámaso Alonso, ‘Menéndez Pidal y la generación del 98’ [1969], in *Obras Completas* (Madrid: Gredos, 1975), IV, pp. 99-123

⁹ Dolores Franco, *España como preocupación. Antología* (Barcelona: Argos Vergara, 1980): Introduction by Azorín. Epilogue by Julián Marías.

defence of his opinions and an ideology that in the light of his private correspondence and public activity can be viewed as perfectly coherent.

Let us make some mention, however, of the disciples, as I promised above. Where this is concerned, it is worth mentioning that what happened with Don Ramón did not happen with other leading lights of Spanish culture: he created a school. Don Ramón's intellectual descendants make up an illustrious list of names, which must be added to the names already cited – Lapesa, the two Alonsos or Salinas –: those of Américo Castro, Tomás Navarro Tomás, Samuel Gili Gaya, Vicente Llorens, Antonio García Solalinde or Vicente García de Diego; from this group onwards his direct disciples formed a veritable legion across several decades that in one way or other, explicitly or tacitly, comes down to the present day. The foreign Hispanists trained in Madrid alongside Don Ramón include the names of some of the foremost scholars in this speciality, such as Marcel Bataillon from France, Arnald Steiger from Switzerland, or Gunnar Tilander from Finland. In North America we can see his intellectual stamp in all its clarity after his visit to the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore in 1909; there he gave a series of lectures in French that later took shape in a book that is fundamental for understanding his ideology: *La epopeya castellana a través de la literatura española*, the 1945 Spanish version of a book previously published in French in 1910.

His contacts with the United States on the academic side gradually became closer and this allowed him to place one of his foremost disciples there, Antonio García Solalinde, who undertook outstanding work during the years he spent at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, despite the fact that he died young in 1937. In 1931, Solalinde created the Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, which took on the task of editing the writings of Alfonso X el Sabio and compiling a great dictionary of medieval Spanish; after his death, this project was continued by a disciple, Lloyd Kasten, whom we can properly consider Menéndez Pidal's intellectual grandchild. Other disciples of Don Ramón's found a home in Latin America or North America, either of their own volition or impelled by the vagaries of historical circumstance, like Américo Castro, Amado Alonso, Tomás Navarro Tomás, José Fernández Montesinos, Federico de Onís, or Homero Serís. Those who trained alongside the former can also be labelled Don Ramón's intellectual grandchildren; for instance, Ana María Barrenechea, María Rosa Lida, Raimundo Lida, Marcos A. Moríñigo, or Ángel Rosemblat trained under Amado Alonso in Buenos Aires (from where he would later move to Harvard). In the present day, Pidal's seal can be seen in several American research scholars who continue working on the epic and the *Romancero* after receiving the necessary training at the University of California-Davis under an exceptional researcher, Samuel Armistead, who remains faithful to the memory of his two great masters: Don Ramón, now far off; and after him, one of his own favourite disciples, Américo Castro.

Hispanic studies in Britain followed different paths, or else took directions that would run parallel for decades, as can be seen in its interest in the *roman* or *novela* present in the researches of William James Entwistle and his intellectual inheritors. Only the School of Catalan Philology, from the time of Milá i Fontanals, displayed similar interests. Catalan Romance scholars (with its paradigm in Martín de Riquer) also approached the French and Occitan epic with a different purpose from that undertaken by Don Ramón, who referred to both in order to mark the distance with regard to Spanish epic poetry. Reaction to Pidal's theses came from the British neo-individualist school of critics via the early research work of Peter Russell, da-

ting from the fifties, or via those of Colin Smith and Ian Michael, undertaken a decade later. The critical point would come with *The making of the PMC* (1983), a work by Smith that sparked off reactions ranging from scepticism to anger on the part of large sectors of critical opinion, neo-traditionalist or otherwise; years before, the battle over the *Romancero* had been engaged with attacks such as those by Daniel Devoto and replies such as those by Diego Catalán at the *Primer Coloquio Internacional sobre el Romancero de 1973. El romancero en la tradición moderna*. If in the study of the epic the breach opened up between the neo-traditionalists and the neo-individualists was healed in part with the balm of oralism, in part with the sane eclecticism of the last twenty years, something similar has happened in the case of the *Romancero*; scholars in one camp or the other initiated an agreeable coexistence at the Congress on the subject held in Los Angeles in 1985; henceforth, scholarly practice when editing and studying the ballads would reflect the advisability of finding support at one and the same time in ancient printed matter as well as in the oral tradition. In this way, we see that Don Ramón's legacy remains perfectly viable at the beginning of the 21st century.

Chronology

- 1869. He was born on 13th March in La Coruña (Galicia, Spain).
- 1890. He obtained his degree in Philosophy and Letters from the Universidad de Madrid.
- 1891. His first work, 'La peregrinación de un cuento', is published in the *El Porvenir de Labiana* newspaper.
- 1892. He was awarded a PhD in Philosophy and Letters from the Universidad de Madrid for his thesis about Don Juan Manuel and the medieval tale.
- 1895. He obtained a prize awarded by the Real Academia Española for his work 'Gramática y vocabulario del *Poema del Cid*'.
- 1899. He obtained the Chair in Comparative Philology of Latin and Spanish at the Universidad de Madrid.
- 1900. He married María Goyri y Arana.
- 1902. He was appointed numerary academic of the Real Academia Española de la Lengua. His admission paper was on *El condenado por desconfiado* by Tirso de Molina.
- 1905. He travelled to America as Spanish Royal Deputy to solve the frontier disputes between Peru and Equador.
- 1907. He was appointed member of the Junta para Ampliación de Estudios, which was presided over by Santiago Ramón y Cajal.
- 1912. He was appointed numerary academic of the Real Academia de la Historia. He read his admission speech, about the *Crónica General de España*, a few years later, in 1916.
- 1921. He is appointed Doctor *Honoris Causa* by the Université de Toulouse.
- 1922. Oxford University granted him the title of Doctor *Honoris Causa*.
- 1925. The three large volumes *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal* are published this year.
- 1926. He was appointed Director of the Real Academia Española de la Lengua.
- 1936. As a consequence of the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, he went on exile: Cuba, United States and France.
- 1939. When the conflict was over, he returned to Spain.
- 1947. After a parenthesis, he was newly chosen Director of the Real Academia Española de la Lengua.
- 1954. By a decree of the Spanish Ministry of Education, the Seminario Menéndez Pidal was constituted at the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters of the Universidad de Madrid. María Goyri, his wife, died that same year.

1965-1966. His last piece of research was published: an article-review of *The Singer of Tales*, the book by Alfred Lord.

1968. He died on 14th November in Madrid and was buried at the Sacramental de San Justo.

Selected bibliography

1. Books

- La leyenda de los siete Infantes de Lara* (Madrid, 1896; repr. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1971).
Crónicas generales de España (Madrid: Real Biblioteca, 1898).
Cantar de mio Cid: texto, gramática y vocabulario (1898; Madrid: Imp. de Bailly-Bailliére, 1908).
Manual elemental de gramática histórica española (Madrid: Tello, 1904).
Primera crónica general: estoria de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289 (Madrid: Bailly-Bailliére, 1906).
Cantar de mio Cid (Madrid: Bailly-Bailliére, 1908-1911).
Documentos lingüísticos de España, vol. I: Reino de Castilla (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1919).
Floresta de leyendas heroicas españolas: Rodrigo, el último godo (Madrid: La Lectura, 1925, 1926 y 1928).
Orígenes del español: estado lingüístico de la península ibérica hasta el siglo XI (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1926).
La España del Cid, pictures by Pedro Muguruza (Madrid: Plutarco, 1929; rev. in 1947).
El romancero. Teorías e investigaciones (Madrid: Páez, 1927).
Historia troyana en prosa y verso. Texto de hacia 1270, ed. by Ramón Menéndez Pidal and Eudasio Varón Vallejo (Madrid: Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios, 1934).
Poesía juglaresca y juglares. Aspectos de la historia literaria y cultural de España (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1924; reeds. 1942, 1945, 1969).
Los españoles en la literatura (1949; Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1971).
Los españoles en la historia: cimas y depresiones en la curva de su vida política (1949; Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1971).
El Imperio Hispánico y los cinco Reinos, dos épocas en la estructura política de España (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios políticos, 1950).
Reliquias de la poesía épica española (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1951).
Romancero Hispánico (Hispano-portugués, americano y sefardí) (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1953).
Romancero tradicional de las lenguas hispánicas (español-portugués-catalán-sefardí) (Madrid: Gredos, 1957).
La 'Chanson de Roland' y el neotradicionalismo. Orígenes de la épica románica (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1959).
Crestomatía del español medieval, finished and revised by Rafael Lapesa and María Soledad de Andrés (Madrid: Gredos, 1965-1966).
La épica medieval española: Desde sus orígenes hasta su disolución en el Romancero, ed. by Diego Catalán and María del Mar de Bustos (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1992).

2. Articles

- 'Poema de Yúçuf. Materiales para su estudio', *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 7 (1902), 91-129, 276-309 and 347-362 (with Francisco Codera).
 'Razón de amor con los Denuestos del agua y el vino', *Revue Hispanique*, 13 (1905), 602-618.
 'Elena y María (Disputa del clérigo y el caballero). Poesía leonesa inédita del siglo XIII', *Revista de Filología Española*, 1 (1914), 52-96.
 'Roncesvalles. Un nuevo cantar de gesta español del siglo XIII', *Revista de Filología Española*, 4 (1917), 105-204.

‘Cantos románicos andalusíes, continuadores de una lírica latina vulgar’, *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 31 (1951), 187-270.

‘Los cantores épicos yugoeslavos y los occidentales. El *Mío Cid* y dos refundidores primitivos’, *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, (1965-1966), 195-225.

3. Bibliography about Menéndez Pidal

Rafael Lapesa, ‘Don Ramón Menéndez Pidal (1869-1968)’, *Razón y Fe*, 856 (1969), 475-492 (also in *Generaciones y semblanzas de filólogos españoles* [Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 1998], 11-36).

Yakov Malkiel, ‘Era omne esencial...’, *Romance Philology*, 23 (1970), 371-411.

Joaquín Pérez Villanueva, *Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Su vida y su tiempo*, pref. Rafael Lapesa, (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1991).

José Ignacio Pérez Pascual, *Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Ciencia y pasión* (Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León, 1998).

E. Michael Gerli, ‘Inventing the Spanish Middle Ages: Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Spanish Cultural History, and Ideology in Philology’, *La Corónica*, 30 (2001), 111-126.

Charles H. Haskins (1870 – 1937)

Julia PAVÓN
(Universidad de Navarra)

C. H. Haskins was the founder of scientific research into the Middle Ages in the United States at a key moment, moreover, in America's own history. In the opening two decades of the 20th century, a series of decisive changes were taking place in the socio-political and cultural concepts of this emerging power. This study therefore seeks to present and convey the importance that his teachings and intellectual legacy as a teacher but also as a prominent man of his times had in the past and continues to a certain extent to have today.

In these pages, we will look firstly at his life and work, which will enable us to more fully understand the character and magnitude of his vast body of work, which we will then go on to analyse.

A Fruitful Life

Charles Homer Haskins was born in Meadville (Pennsylvania) on 21 December 1870¹. When he was barely five or six years old, he was taught Latin by his father and not long afterwards Greek. At the age of 13 he entered the renowned Allegheny College in his home city, where his father was a teacher. He was just 17 when he obtained his B.A. degree from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore (Maryland)². In 1890, he received his Ph.D. in American History, supervised by Herbert Baxter Adams, from the same university. There he met Frederick Jackson Turner and Woodrow Wilson, who were, like him, influenced by the German historiographical methods of Adams, and did not follow the approach of other American universities of the time, which was to tell history through narratives based on romantic and religious idealism³.

As he was a gifted and talented teacher, he began teaching American History that same year of 1890, initially as a lecturer at the University of Wisconsin (Madison), a year later as Assistant Professor and finally as Full Professor in 1892.

¹ The account of Charles H. Haskins's life and work by R. P. Blake, G. R. Coffman and E. K. Rand ("Obituary note. Charles Homer Haskins", *Speculum*, 14 (1939), 413-415) has been of great initial value in reconstructing his biography. I'm grateful for the orientation that Ignacio Olábarri has made during this research.

² Just a few years earlier, Woodrow Wilson, who was later to become President of the United States, obtained his doctorate from the same university.

³ Sally Vaughn, "Charles Homer Haskins (1870-1937)", in *Medieval Scholarship. Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline*, ed. by Helen Damico and Joseph B. Zavadil (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1995), pp. 170-171.

At that time, his great friend F.J. Turner (1861-1932)⁴ was beginning to make a name for himself at the same university. Turner was Professor of American History at Wisconsin from 1889 to 1910, when he moved to teach at Harvard, remaining there until his retirement in 1924. In 1893, Turner presented his paper on *The Significance of the Frontier in American History* at the American Historical Association meeting held during the Chicago World's Columbian Exposition. It was there that he presented his theory —initially to no great acclaim, it must be said— on the importance of the evolutionary process of the frontier in the history of the United States, which, he said, had a decisive effect in shaping the collective and individual character of the American people and their institutions, forging principles such as individualism, nationalism, mobility and egalitarianism.

Despite Haskins's initial interest in the field of legal research, it seems that in his early years at university, influenced by the seminars taught by Adams, he concentrated on themes from American history. Thus it was that he came to write his first study, *The Yazoo Land Companies of Mississippi*⁵. Once settled in Madison, however, he gave up the field of Law to focus on European history, especially after the profound mark left on him by his time spent studying in Europe (1887-1890).

The approximately four years he spent in France, England, Italy, Germany and Spain made a profound impression on him, both personally and as an academic. He seems to have worked in the main in the *École des Chartes* and the *Bibliothèque Nationale* in Paris under the supervision of Charles Victor Langlois and Ferdinand Lot⁶, though he also studied at the British Museum, *El Escorial*, the *Monumenta Institut* in Berlin, the Vatican Library and the archives in Rouen and Palermo, as well as other lesser known places. He also struck up a friendship with French historians of the stature of Ernest Lavisse, Charles Bémont, Henri Omont and Leopold Victor Delisle⁷, and also became a favourite amongst the staff at those institutions where he spent hours delving into historical texts and books.

⁴ Turner also received his Ph.D. in 1890 from Johns Hopkins University. A year after his death, he was posthumously awarded the Pulitzer Prize; see Richard Hofstadter, *Los Historiadores Progresistas. Turner, Beard, Parrington* (Buenos Aires: Paidós, 1970), pp. 57-159 and Ernst Breisach, *Historiography. Ancient, Medieval & Modern* (Chicago & London: Chicago University Press, 1983), pp. 313-317.

⁵ C. H. Haskins, "The Yazoo land companies", *Papers of the American Historical Association*, 5 (1891), 59-103.

⁶ Ferdinand Lot (1866-1952), a medievalist scholar who trained at the *École des Chartes* and was a member of the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1924-1939). He is particularly noted for his edition of the series of *Diplomata Karolinorum*. C. V. Langlois (1863-1929), another medievalist whose work and teaching centred on the 12th to 14th centuries.

⁷ Professor Ernest Lavisse (1842-1922), a specialist in the history of France and Germany between the 17th and 19th centuries, a member of the *Académie Française* (1892) and principal of the *École Normale Supérieure* (1904-1919). He was the head of the University Studies Committee that put together for the Paris Peace Conference two volumes with detailed maps on the problems that had been plaguing Europe since the 19th century. He was the most eminent member of the so-called 'methodical school'. Charles Bémont (1848-1939), another medievalist, was famed for his work on English charters granting liberties, for which he was held in very high regard amongst the British academic community. L.V. Delisle (1826-1910) was the director of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* in Paris between 1874 and 1905. He published a large number of archivists treatises, catalogues and inventories of the medieval material in the library, and also edited a number of codices. H. Omont (1857-1940) was a teacher at the *École des Chartes* and studied the medieval and modern codices and manuscripts held in public and private libraries in France.

During that period, Haskins directed his research towards two different themes as a result of the wealth of documentation that he was able to handle⁸. The first of these themes was the legal, governing and administrative bodies of the Norman world, including an examination of the cases of Sicily and England from the 8th century. Thus he laid the groundwork for *The Normans in European History*, published in 1915, and *Norman Institutions*, published in 1918. His second area of study was the world of culture, science and intellectual life, which led to *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, published in 1924, and *Studies in Mediaeval Culture*, published in 1929, the fruit undoubtedly of his close study and interest in Antiquity⁹.

In 1902 he was appointed a Professor at Harvard University, where he had already worked as a guest lecturer in history in the second half of the 1899-1900 academic year. Upon the death of Charles Gross¹⁰, Haskins was appointed to the Senior Chair in European History (1912). Years later, he was to become the Henry Charles Lea¹¹ Professor of Medieval History—a chair founded in 1928 by Nina Lea—until he was forced by Parkinson's Disease to retire, at which point he was appointed an Emeritus Professor.

Between 1908 and 1924, he was the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Following his return from the Paris Peace Conference, in which he played an active part as adviser to President Wilson, he founded the Mediaeval Academy of America and its journal, *Speculum*. Furthermore, during his time at the helm, the prestige of Harvard University rose, even above traditionally renowned institutions such as Johns Hopkins University, Columbia University and the University of Chicago.

In 1912, he married Clare Allen, a French teacher at May School in Boston, and they had three children, George Lee, Charles Allen and Clare Elisabeth. Haskins maintained a high cultural tone in the home and a balance between his professional and family life. His eldest son became a Junior Fellow at Harvard, continuing the path of medieval studies begun by his father.

Haskins's talent and personality were not restricted to his professorship. Through his active professional life, he led and played a prominent role in many of the most important academic organisations of his country. He was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Philosophical Society and the Massachusetts Historical Society. He was president of the American Historical Association (1922), the Mediaeval Academy of America (1926) and the American Council of Learned Societies (1923), and was also editor of *The America Historical Series*.

⁸ Haskins' subsequent visits to Europe were largely so that he could consult documentary sources (Vaughn, pp. 170, 172-173).

⁹ It should not be forgotten that the first subjects he taught at Harvard University were the history of Rome and Roman Law.

¹⁰ Gross (1857-1909), an American scholar who studied in European universities such as Leipzig, Berlin, Paris and Göttingen. He was of the generation prior to that of Haskins and taught at Harvard from 1888, becoming a professor of history and political science. His works and teaching focussed on the history of English institutions in the Middle Ages (C. H. Haskins, 'Charles Gross', *Studies in Mediaeval Culture*, pp. 262-268).

¹¹ Lea (1825-1909), a personal friend of Haskins—C. H. Haskins, 'Henry Charles Lea', *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), pp. 256-262—was a rich businessman who spent much of his time studying the history of the Church and the Inquisition in Western Europe. His wealth enabled him to accumulate an extensive library, which he bequeathed to the University of Pennsylvania. Without wishing to enter into a critical discussion on his work, we can say that he was one of the first generation of intellectuals and scholars who laid the foundations for a school of history in the United States.

During his life, he received several honorary degrees, including a Master's from Harvard University, a Doctorate from Allegheny College, Doctorates in Letters from the universities of Wisconsin, Strasbourg, Padua, Manchester, Harvard, Paris, Louvain, Caen and Mantua. He was made an Officer of the Legion of Honour of France and a member of the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* of the Institut de France, of the British Academy, of the Royal Historical Society, of the *Academia de las Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, of the academies of Rouen and Caen, of the *Société des Antiquaires* of Normandy and of the *Academia Pontificia di Archeologia*. In addition, he was given the title of Commander of the Order of the Crown of Belgium and shortly before his death was appointed *Honorary Foreign Correspondent of the Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*.

Diplomatic activity: Wilson and the progressive American project

After the Great War (1914-1918), President Woodrow Wilson took with him as the members of the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919-1920 Secretary of State Lansing, General Tasker H. Bliss, Henry White, a career diplomat, and Edward House (1858-1938). House was a great friend of his since his early years in politics but with whom he was to break off all relations during the course of the negotiations following a series of increasing disagreements¹².

Hundreds of experts also set off for Paris in order to work on economic, legal and territorial matters. Prominent among them were undoubtedly Haskins himself and Robert Howard Lord, a colleague of his from Harvard¹³.

It is unsurprising that two eminent professors were part of the circle of advisers around the American President (1913-1921), above all if we look at Wilson's life up to 1910. Wilson (1856-1924) was the son and grandson of Scottish Presbyterian ministers. He graduated in Law from the University of Virginia and received his doctorate from Johns Hopkins University. From that time onwards, his life and work were linked to Princeton University and he became the *alma mater* of the campus. In 1902, after more than decade as a Professor of jurisprudence and political economy, he became President of the university.

His views on society and politics made him a noted public figure, to the extent that he was considered an ideal candidate for the presidency by some members of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party (in particular, George Harvey, the editor of *Harper's Weekly*). Initially elected as Governor of New Jersey (1910) —a model of democracy and efficient administration— he distanced himself from the conservatives and, opposed by a divided Republican Party, won the presidential elections of 1912 on a progressive ticket¹⁴.

¹² Inga Floto, *Colonel House in Paris. A Study of American Policy at the Paris Peace Conference 1919* (Copenhagen: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1973).

¹³ Lord had already written in 1915 *The Second Partition of Poland: A Study in Diplomatic History*, Harvard University Press. In 1924, following his experience in Europe, he was to reflect on the origins of the Franco-Prussian war in *The Origins of the War of 1870. New Documents from the German Archives*, Harvard University Press.

¹⁴ Mention must be made, by way of an example, of the classic biography of Wilson by Arthur S. Link, *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era* (New York: Harper and Row, 1954).

His legislative measures on trade, tax and employment in Congress to control big company monopolies, to improve taxes and to regulate the working day contributed towards his re-election in 1916 at the height of the First World War in Europe.

Wilson initially kept his country neutral, but on 2 April 1917 the United States declared war on Germany, entering into an already long and complex conflict. The time had now come for Wilson to mobilise the nation both physically and spiritually so that it would join the fight:

"It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest to our hearts - for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations [...] the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured"¹⁵.

One year later, in January 1918, at a Joint Session of Congress, Wilson gave a speech outlining his objectives and plans for his country to put an end to the bloody war. These were his famed 'Fourteen Points'¹⁶, which express a new vision of diplomacy and relations with Europe. Wilson was warning European politicians that peace and security do not depend on intricate military alliances and that diplomatic relations could no longer be directed in secret by experts but through open accords. The Great War was not, therefore, the result of intractable geopolitical conflicts but of nations' inadequate practices¹⁷.

The President's postulates broke with and to a certain extent revolutionised historical experience and the traditional ways of European powers—we should remember one of the tenets of the American diplomatic front, which can be summed up in the famous phrase "peace without victory". And yet they were in keeping with the political and cultural climate of the early 20th century, which specialists have termed 'Wilsonian progressivism'¹⁸. This definition applied to his political tasks reflected in the new ways and intentions of a government led by men from a new generation—in the main from universities—that were very different to those of the 'Lincoln era' and who, against the background heat generated by the transformation of

¹⁵ Wilson's speech to Congress on 2 April 1917 asking Congress to declare war.

¹⁶ Wilson put forward eight essential points: open diplomacy; freedom of navigation upon the seas; the removal of economic and trade barriers; reduction in armaments; impartial adjustment of colonial claims; the evacuation and restoration of Belgium; the evacuation of Russian territory; and the creation of a general association of nations. His remaining six points were not indispensable: the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France; the opportunity for autonomous development for the minorities living in the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires; a readjustment of the Italian frontiers; the evacuation of the Balkans; the opening of the Dardanelles as a passage for all nations; and the creation of an independent Poland with free and secure access to the sea.

¹⁷ See Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994).

¹⁸ Robert M. Cruden, *Ministers of Reform: The Progressives' Achievement in American Civilization 1889-1920* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1984), and James T. Kloppenberg, *Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought 1870-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 298-415 and more specifically pp. 362-364. More classical in approach, though no less enlightening, is the *Historia de los Estados Unidos de Norteamérica* of S. Eliot Morison and H. Steele Commager (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1951), v. II, pp. 471-497.

American into an industrial society, had to display sufficient energy to make their mark and to defend public interests¹⁹.

During Wilson's government, the United States emerged from its isolationism to become a leading player on the world stage, ushering in a new and firm doctrine advocated by the President himself: the freedom and security of nations depended on the spread of democracy and/or a universal system of law. In this way, his country began to spread abroad the tenets of American thinking in order to offer its commitment, which has even been described as providential, to guaranteeing moral standards in the world order and universal liberties: democracy, joint security and the principle of self-determination.

When Wilson publicly announced on 18 November, a week after Armistice, his intention of travelling to Europe (13 December 1918–28 June 1919) in order to take part in the peace talks²⁰, he had very specific aims. He was convinced that all the countries were interested in peace and that they would therefore make common cause against anyone that disturbed it. This called for the shaping of a new diplomatic world order that took the form of the League of Nations (28 April 1919), an institution that was North American in essence and whose covenant was incorporated into the Versailles Treaty.

On 12 January 1919, the allies gathered at the opening of a conference that prefaced the Peace Conference itself, which began on 18 January. Twenty-seven nations, plus the British dominions, took part in the conference officially opened by the French president Raymond Poincaré. The Council of Ten (the United States, Japan, Britain, Italy and France) was of particular importance, and a total of 52 committees of numerous experts were set up. Finally, on 24 March, the Committee of Four, the veritable artificer for peace, was set. Great Britain was represented by David Lloyd George, France by Georges Clemenceau, Italy by Vittorio Orlando, the prime minister who was eclipsed by his foreign minister, Sidney Sonnino, and lastly the United States by President Wilson²¹.

Those responsible for the war must pay and they must be punished. Finally, if possible, effective measures must be taken to prevent the recurrence of a similar war, whether brought about by Germany's lust of conquest or by any other State. If war could not be prevented, it must at least be rendered more difficult and more abhorrent to the common moral sense of mankind²². In the minds of most of those who knew him, the background of Haskins's contributions as a member of the American

¹⁹ Both Inga Floto, *Colonel House*, pp. 28–31, and Kloppenberg, *Social Democracy*, pp. 363–364, point to the influence on Wilson's thinking of *The New Republic*, founded in 1914, and edited by Herbert Croly (1869–1930) and Walter Lippman (1889–1974). Lippman also travelled to Europe during the pre-Armistice negotiations as head of the United States Intelligence Service.

²⁰ Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, *Clemenceau* (Paris: Fayard, 1988), chapter 22, pp. 720–773.

²¹ The deliberations are known thanks to the work of one of the main interpreters, the economic historian Paul Mantoux, *Les Délibérations du Conseil des Quatre. Notes de l'officier interprète Paul Mantoux* (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1955).

²² C. H. Haskins and Robert H. Lord, *Some problems about the Conference of Peace* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920), pp. 6–7.

Delegation at the Peace Conference was marked by his personality and his in-depth knowledge of history²³.

The historian knows better, and his countrymen need his steadying vision, which puts the present in its perspective and interprets it in the light of the past. The war was, from one point of view, a conflict of national psychologies, and peace is much the same. Each nation, in Clemenceau's phrase, "lives encased in its own past", and its actions are determined by its inherited mentality²⁴. This, of course, without underestimating his vision and territorial projection of a new Central Europe and applying the American principle of public mediation over and above the ethnic, linguistic and religious pluralism of Europe.

As president of the Western European Division of the Peace Conference, Haskins was responsible for establishing the territories and frontiers in the Saar Basin, Alsace-Lorraine, Belgium and Schleswig-Holstein, while his colleague Robert H. Lord dealt with the reconstruction of Poland, the now dead Russian Empire and part of East Germany, with the establishment of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, combining small entities arising from the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, as well as other border matters in the Balkans²⁵.

Shortly after their return to the United States, Lord and Haskins gave a series of talks at the Lowell Institute (January 1920) on what they believed had been one of the most important results of the Peace Conference: the territorial readjustments and the emergence of new nations. Their views were published a few months later in May and have today become a fascinating document for understanding not only the genesis of the new map of Europe, but also an idealistic concept of territory, in principle unrelated to the intricate continental situation, even though it advocated a possible and lasting peace under the auspices of the League of Nations.

At a theoretical level, Haskins, like Lord, considered three simple working elements —peoples, lands and national authority— in order to create politically and economically functioning states of a multiethnic nature in the style of the US model. In his opinion, there were no grounds as to why nations, in many instances with pronounced signs of identity, be they linguistic, geographical or related to material culture, should be able to demand self-determination and that, as Wilson himself argued, "liberty is the privilege of maturity, of self-control... some peoples may have it [self-determination], therefore, and others may not"²⁶. Even so, in the design of the new map, these minorities were not expected to renounce their past but rather, in order to balance the social and economic organisation of the new countries, their rights were to be safeguarded.

One of the key questions in the Committee of Four's deliberations, and the subject of wide-ranging and long discussions, was the issue of the Saar Basin and Alsace-Lorraine, above all due to the pressure and aspirations of France. André Tardieu

²³ Those who signed his obituary point out that "*Haskins turned perforce from the Middle Ages to the immediate present, or, rather, he applied to the present a mind that had never ceased to view all history 'sub specie humanitatis'*" (Blake, Coffman and Rand, "Obituary note", p. 415, see note 1). Or, for example, the appeals that he and Robert H. Lord make on behalf of humanity in the introduction to *Some problems* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920), p. 7.

²⁴ Ch. H. Haskins, "European History and American Scholarship", *American Historical Review*, 28 (1923), 224.

²⁵ Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement* (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

²⁶ Haskins and Lord, 14.

for France²⁷, James Wycliffe Headlam-Morley for Britain²⁸ and Charles Haskins himself made up the advisory committee for this question from 2 April 1919. However, their committee was unlike the other Conference bodies, as they had no secretary and the legal and economic advisers were not expected to attend every one of their meetings, of which more than one was held each day. Their task consisted instead of being present at the gatherings of the Committee of Four when they were discussing these matters in order to provide advice and information.

The intense activity of the American professor during March and April, especially after the confrontation between Wilson and Clemenceau over the issue of the Saar Basin²⁹, a coal region later exploited by France for 15 years, is documented in this case, for want of a closer study of the sources³⁰. The French also aspired to the regions of Alsace-Lorraine, which had been ceded to Germany under the Treaty of Frankfurt of 1871, following the Franco-Prussian War, and the left bank of the Rhine (articles 42-44 of the Treaty of Versailles).

Haskins undoubtedly displayed his profound knowledge and made known his views of the historical genesis of the regions being discussed, precedents that called not just for a mere narration of the most distant and most recent past of these territories, but also their inclusion as intellectual elements in a complex diplomatic debate. The 70 pages that he devotes in his book on the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, to give an example, put up for discussion all the arguments that led to the taking of that decision, recorded in article 51 and in articles 52-79, with the appendices, of the Treaty of Versailles. These arguments included the economic interests, language, migratory movements, the cultural legacy, the imperialist interests of the Reichstag, the institutions and the sentiments of the local peoples, because the issue "concerned not merely France and Germany and the inhabitants of the territory itself, but the world at large", leading the way for the arguments of the American mediators: "the wrong done to France in 1871 should be righted"³¹.

²⁷ A. Tardieu (1876-1945), a political analyst for *Le Temps* and *L'Echo National*, was elected as a French deputy in 1914 and later participated in the war and very actively in the peace talks. He had a modest political career but nevertheless rose to be Interior Minister in 1926 and Premier for a few months in 1932. He retired from politics in 1936.

²⁸ James W. Headlam-Morley (1863-1929) had a life equally as interesting as Haskins. He came from an academic background (professor at Cambridge and Queen's College, London) and specialised in ancient history. He spent a number of years living in Germany, which gave him a profound knowledge of its history. During the war he worked for the Political Intelligence Department (1917-1920) and was a key figure for his country in the talks in Paris, as he was a member of the consultative bodies on the Saar, Gdansk, Alsace-Lorraine, the German borders and national minorities. He published a large number of works on the origins of the war, its consequences and German history.

²⁹ Arthur Walworth, *Wilson and his Peacemakers. American Diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919* (London: Norton, 1986), pp. 269-270 and 322-323; Floto, 198-208; and Haskins and Lord, 144-150.

³⁰ There is the possibility of consulting Haskins's letters and papers in the Houghton Library; as well as Arthur S. Link (compiler), *Papers of Woodrow Wilson* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966); and André Tardieu, *The Truth about the Treaty* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1921). There are also the sources and the bibliography cited by Floto, 362-370.

³¹ Haskins and Lord, p. 85; the second of these two quotations are the words of President Wilson, p. 109.

At first, Haskins was not burdened with the complex issue of the borders between France and Germany, and so also worked on the advisory committee dealing with the territorial problems between Denmark and Germany (Schleswig-Holstein), as well as the adjustments concerning Belgium. To these he applied the selfsame methodology and his vision of history³².

Though the dreadful outcome of a treaty that came to be known in Germany as the Diktat is common knowledge, the American contributions to the Treaty cannot be considered as being mistaken. Haskins, like most of the diplomats working on the Treaty of Versailles, was convinced that the party responsible for the war should pay, and the accords were reached “for the world of 1919 by men of 1919, on the assumption that what was needed was an early peace as well as just settlement”³³. As a result, we should not be too quick to dub his posture as Francophile³⁴, for if we study his contributions carefully, we can see reflections on history in which we find more measure and logic than pro-Gallic sentiment. For example, he concludes his assessment of the issue of the Rhine thus: “it was not always possible to distinguish what was imperialistic by nature from what was necessary to the restoration and protection of France”³⁵.

For his part, drawing on his background as a humanist, as well as his perspective as an American, Haskins recognised that the instrument formalised in Paris was not perfect. Peace was a dynamic, constructive and future task that required more than a provisional commitment amongst nations or individuals, such as the diplomatic accords of the 19th century. He pointed out that a notable and honest effort such as the Paris endeavour did not aspire to being the end of the chapter, but yardsticks for a new Europe whose possible problems would be arbitrated by the League of Nations.

Medieval History Studies in America

Prior to the 20th century, American historians were, to put it thus, men of letters with significant financial resources who linked their enthusiasm and narrative endeavours and erudition with a Romantic fiction and philosophy. Noteworthy amongst them were George Bancroft, Henry Adams and Henry Charles Lea, as the vision and methodology gave rise to new changes with Francis Parkman and Herbert Baxter Adams, whose seminars at Johns Hopkins became a source of many of the historians of the early 20th century, such as Turner and Haskins themselves³⁶. Their lessons were key to the professionalisation of history in their country. H.B. Adams—who studied in Heidelberg (1874-1876) using the empirical method established by Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) in his *Geschichten der lateinischen und germanischen Völker*, 1824, which involved a detailed analysis and use of archive materials—

³² Haskins and Lord, pp. 38-73, and Walworth, *Wilson and his peacemakers*, pp. 272-275.

³³ Haskins and Lord, p. 32.

³⁴ Walworth, p. 255.

³⁵ Haskins and Lord, p. 127.

³⁶ Richard Hofstadter presents the 19th-century panorama of history and historians in the United States in *Los Historiadores Progresistas*, pp. 19-53. [1st ed. *The Progressive Historians: Turner, Beard, Parrington* (New York: Knopf, 1968).]

was of the view that the study of the historical and institutional roots of America was of vital importance, “because the study of medieval history, therefore, could offer no great truths or lessons for the guidance of American life”³⁷.

Between 1910 and 1930, history as a discipline changed direction in the United States: it shook off the shackles of outdated idealism or bias and instead adopted a critical apparatus within an academic framework in order to establish objectivity and to co-operate with other social sciences. This concern amongst the scientific community to overcome the conventional and political history of the 19th century gave rise to a generation that supported others and that led the ‘New History’ and/or ‘Progressive History’.

This broad movement to reform history studies with various aspects, and not just a school or programme, was based on progressive political values and on pragmatic attitudes towards historical knowledge, the aim being that democratic values should pervade all areas of society. William James, Charles Peirce and John Dewey laid the foundations of their intellectual pillars by resorting to the social sciences on the grounds that they were useful in researching “the real history of men and women”, though the most prominent figures were Charles A. Beard, James Harvey Robinson (Columbia University), Vernon Parrington, Carl Becker and Frederick Jackson Turner³⁸. With a common denominator similar to that of the so-called muckrakers—journalists whose sought out political and social scandal to expose prominent people—these historians and a large group of writers, politicians and scientists championed regulation of the economy, public services and improvements to living conditions for the working class, the end of corruption and the use of modern science to bring about social improvements and solutions to industrial problems. In short, they contributed a rational historical basis to liberal reformist politics and thinking³⁹.

In this new academic climate, and initially under the influence of Von Ranke’s method, F.J. Turner picked up H.B. Adams’s baton with a view to studying the history of his country in greater depth, though he later dropped this ‘germ theory’ and turned instead to his ‘frontier theory’ to explain the exceptional nature of America. His frontier theory was to be of great importance in American history and historiography, as this frontier society continued to look for new frontiers for the progressive state, once the period of conquest was over.

Haskins, in contrast, was attracted to the Middle Ages, where he found, like his early colleagues in the discipline, many of the keys explaining the origins and institutional roots of modern America, a country that sought its identifying signs in the Anglo-Saxon past, which was one of the paradoxes for this science in the United States, which lacked a medieval past⁴⁰. Nevertheless, this lack did not prevent it

³⁷ Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *The Past as Text. The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), pp. 60-61.

³⁸ After the First World War, this historiographical tradition was continued by Merle Curti, Harry Elmer Barnes, Henry Steele Commager and Arthur Schlesinger, *A Global Encyclopedia of Historical Writing*, ed. by D.R. Woof, (New York-London: Garland, 1998) vol. II, p. 744 and pp. 657-658, respectively.

³⁹ For further and more detailed information on the American reform of history studies, see Breisach, pp. 313-318 and 362-370; and Michael Kammen, *Mystic chords of Memory. The transformation in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), pp. 444-480.

⁴⁰ Spiegel, pp. 57-59.

from establishing a special connection with European history. Indeed, Haskins's method is characterised by historicism in the German style, which underpinned his research into the rational bases of the politics and administration of the monarchical Anglo-Norman and French institutions. A medievalism undoubtedly applied to a historical and political vision of the Wilsonian progressive order which, as has often been remarked, was based on a profound faith in progress, rational reforms and the benefits of government.

After the great man's death, medieval history was, as we shall see later, dominated by his disciples, who took similar approaches in methodology and theme. It was not until the 1970s that there was a major change in American medievalism, when 'positivism' disappeared and history as narration became history as representation, when the strategy of working with texts was renewed, and the historiography of gender emerged.

Work and Vision of History

In his writings, Haskins deals principally with the period of time from the 11th to the 13th centuries, when the foundations of some of the classic political and cultural institutions of European medieval history were laid. With everything that he learned and accumulated in the libraries and archives of Europe, he began the important task of rehabilitating and fostering greater and deeper awareness of the Middle Ages, a time that he considered to be key. Spurred on by his interest in the genesis of the classic models of centralised monarchies, he spent many years studying the sovereign and institutional project of France and England. He was also attracted to the origins of the university spirit, which he felt he was heir to and a part of, and reflected on the university as an institution and on the cultural climate of the 11th and 12th centuries. He later published his most important work, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* in defence of the wealth and intellectual standing of those centuries and lastly concentrated on science, an essential element of medieval culture.

His early works dealt with the Norman monarchy and the institutions of Northern France. After long years of research in archives, he published *The Normans in European History* (1915) and shortly afterwards *Norman Institutions* (1918), which became classics for those keen to learn about the history of French and English institutions of the period.

The other broad area that he considered was the development of thinking and learning, in particular the history of science in the High Middle Ages. His painstaking study of the great collections of European manuscripts during his time in Europe brought him into contact with materials and direct sources, at that time unknown, and so he was able to shed new light on a wide range of problems discussed in numerous articles. The most important results of these last investigations were published in two collections of essays, *Studies in the History of Science* (1924) and *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (1929). As well as these varied monographic studies, he also drew up a fascinating and wide-ranging synthesis, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (1927).

The volume *Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History*, published as a tribute to him in 1929, written by some of his *discipulorum laudabilis numerus* whom he had inspired

and taught, contains a list of his more than 180 publications compiled by G.W. Robinson, a complete *Speculum* of the Middle Ages⁴¹.

While an interest in studying national histories held sway in Europe, Haskins began researching the duchy of Normandy (911-1066). It seems that Haskins wanted to increase his and others' knowledge of the gestation and characteristics of the Norman model of government, given the apparent success of its application in England, following William the Conqueror's taking of the British Isles. His analysis sought to find out why this duchy arrived at such a high degree of centralisation and rationalisation in its government and so examined its institutions, which were new in western Europe, in close detail. His research in this field gave rise to *The Normans in European History*—the result of eight lectures given at the Lowell Institute and the University of California—and *Norman Institutions*, published in 1915 and 1918 respectively⁴². 1918 was the year that he began a fruitful ten years of work in the field of history, during which he produced his most important intellectual reflections and presented them to the scientific community.

To Haskins's mind, the dukes of Normandy, the descendants of Scandinavian pirates, managed to shape a centralised power from the mid-10th century onwards thanks above all to the influx of clerics from Flanders, the region of the Rhine and north Italy and their co-operation with political circles. In addition, these clerics had created strong bonds between France, England, Sicily, Ireland and Scotland, thereby establishing the first 'great society' since the Roman Empire. This pan-European history changed many of the premises of historiography of the 1920s and provided new insights into the history and culture of England, which previously had been looked at more from the perspective of its Anglo-Saxon origins⁴³, as Sir Frederick Powicke pointed out⁴⁴.

When presenting an analysis of his thesis, which indicates "the larger features of their work (the Normans' work) as founders and organizers of states and contributors to European culture"⁴⁵, historiography winks knowingly at progressive democracy. Norman F. Cantor believes that Haskins's book is a replica of the programme put forward by Wilson, who, in line with a leading circle of intellectuals, was determined to bring order and rationality to American society at that time⁴⁶. Gabrielle Spiegel also recognises, though in a more moderate manner, in these first two titles by Haskins and, by extension in his entire work, the legacy of Wilson's ambitious political venture. Nevertheless, despite this handicap, it is still acknowledged that Haskins's legacy is, in this respect, still an irreplaceable classic when it comes to explaining the major changes in politics and government in the 11th century in Europe.

⁴¹ George W. Robinson, 'Bibliography of Charles Homer Haskins', in *Haskins Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History*, ed. by Charles H. Taylor (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1929), pp. 389-398.

⁴² C. H. Haskins, *The Normans in European History* (Boston: Houghton, 1915) and *Norman Institutions* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1918).

⁴³ Vaughn, p. 177.

⁴⁴ Frederick M. Powicke, 'Charles Homer Haskins', in *English Historical Review*, 52 (1937), 653, and *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing*, ed. by Kelly Boyd (Chicago-London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1999), vol. I, p. 519.

⁴⁵ As Haskins comments in his preface to *The Normans in European History*, p. vii.

⁴⁶ Norman F. Cantor, *Inventing the Middle Ages* (New York: Morrow, 1991), pp. 275-276.

When he set sail once again for Paris in 1919, the prospect ahead of him bore no relation to the intense days he had spent in archives as a young man. For a long time, he abandoned the classroom for diplomatic meetings which, prior to the Great War, were designing the new political map of the continent. His knowledge of history and his personal worth meant that he was chosen as an adviser on the American delegation that was presided over by Wilson, who was bringing a novel project to Europe.

On his return, he and Robert H. Lord published *Some Problems about the Conference of Peace* (1920), which, as has already been remarked, contains the historical reasons and territorial justifications for the drawing of the new borders. It is very likely that he would at that time already have formulated the idea that constituted the core of the article *European History and American Scholarship* that he was to publish two years later in 1922 in the *American Historical Review*.

By raising the bonds linking Europe and America, which in his view were more evident in times of war—and bearing in mind that one had just finished—he urged his colleagues to help him undertake a noble two-part task: firstly, to demonstrate to his European colleagues the national prejudices that they, as Americans, supposedly lacked; and secondly, and perhaps with greater emphasis, to put an end to the classic dichotomy of the academic world between the history of both continents because “The historian’s world is one: let him interpret it as one, in relation both to scholarship and to the moulding of public opinion!”⁴⁷.

With these words, Haskins brought tumbling down a barrier that had rarely been breached before. His proposals are the wings of this professionalisation desired by historians in his country in order to set in motion serious initiatives that would add to the knowledge of history, and he went on to say: “The question concerns the future of American scholarship, its dignity, its independence, its creative power”⁴⁸.

By the time he gave his three masterly lectures *The Earliest Universities*, *The Mediaeval Professor* and *The Mediaeval Student* in 1923, published together under the title *The Rise of Universities*⁴⁹, with a prologue written by Theodor E. Mommsen (Cornell University), Haskins was already a prominent figure in the university sphere, in which he worked with the true vocation and spirit of a teacher. Indeed, notable amongst his various reflections on the origin and characteristics of the early European universities is his admiration for the original spirit of those medieval institutions, an association of teachers and students who aspired to learning and the passing on of knowledge from one generation to the next right down to the present day, because “the historic continuity is unbroken. They created the university tradition of the modern world, that common tradition which belongs to all our institutions of higher learning...”⁵⁰.

While looking over the countless manuscripts and codices handled during those years amongst erudite European circles, Haskins noticed that a remarkable number contained texts to do with physics, cosmology and mathematics, and not just as simple copies or brief explanations of the great Greek and Arab masters. When he

⁴⁷ C. H. Haskins, ‘European History and American Scholarship’, *American Historical Review*, 28 (1922), 226.

⁴⁸ Haskins, ‘European History and American Scholarship’, p. 215.

⁴⁹ C. H. Haskins, *The Rise of the Universities*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1923).

⁵⁰ Haskins, ‘European History and American Scholarship’, pp. 2-3.

discovered their closed reasonings, mathematical formulations and diagrams, Haskins became a pioneer in presenting medieval science as an area that was both technical and speculative (*Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, 1924)⁵¹. Determined to find funds for a Chair of the History of Science at Harvard, the first occupant of which was to be George Sarton, Haskins ended up institutionalising his study, particularly after the appearance of the journal *Isis*.

In 1928, he published his best known work, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*⁵², which had a major impact in that it refuted the old theory of the great Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt in *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (1860), who held the traditional view of the Middle Ages as dark and superstitious brought to an end only by the Italian Renaissance.

There was much debate in the universities in the 1920s between those who took Burckhardt's view and those who, like Haskins, saw the 15th century as the late flowering of medieval trends⁵³. "The Italian Renaissance was preceded by similar, if less wide-reaching movements".

To the most important of these earlier revivals the present volume is devoted, the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century which is often called the Mediaeval Renaissance. This century, the very century of St. Bernard and his mule, was in many respects an age of fresh and vigorous life. The epoch of the Crusades, of the rise of towns, and of the earliest bureaucratic states of the West, it saw the culmination of Romanesque art and the beginnings of Gothic; the emergence of the vernacular literatures; the revival of the Latin classics and of Latin poetry and Roman law; the recovery of Greek science, with its Arabic additions, and of much of Greek philosophy; and the origin of the first European universities⁵⁴.

The debate has continued since, brought up once again by Wallace K. Ferguson —*The Renaissance in Historical Thought*⁵⁵— and by professors of literature such as Douglas Bush from Harvard or E.M. Tillyard from Cambridge. It has emerged again today with the appearance in the fourth generation of *Annales* of a "new cultural history" and the "history of mentality"⁵⁶. There is a need today to analyse not just this book by Haskins but his entire oeuvre, from the point of view of these new methods and aims; undoubtedly we would be surprised by its modernity.

The last of his works is a varied collection of pieces in *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (1929)⁵⁷. It includes a number of articles already published by him and others that are new on diverse subjects such as *The University of Paris in the Sermons of the Thirteenth Century*, *The Latin Literature of Sport*, *The "Alchemy" ascribed to Michael Scot* and *The Heresy of Eucharist the Baker of Reims*.

What might Haskins's intention have been as he drew up this miscellany? It is likely that he wanted to stress what he saw as primordial from a methodological

⁵¹ C. H. Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1924).

⁵² C. H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927).

⁵³ Vaughn, pp. 178-180.

⁵⁴ Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, p. viii.

⁵⁵ Wallace Klippert Ferguson also published *The Interpretation of the Renaissance: Suggestions for a Synthesis*, 1951; *The Renaissance: Six Essays*, 1962; and *Renaissance Studies* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963).

⁵⁶ *The New Cultural History*, ed. by Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 7-9.

⁵⁷ C. H. Haskins, *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929).

point of view: "great repositories of narrative, documentary, and theological texts are fundamental for our knowledge of the structure of medieval society and the content of the medieval mind, but, taken by themselves, they give too bald and conventional an impression of medieval life and thought."⁵⁸

On the eve of the 40th anniversary of the start of his career as a teacher, and having devoted much of his life to the close study of the Middle Ages, he wanted to demonstrate explicitly one of his great discoveries, become a passion over the years: that documentary sources and narratives form an organic corpus, a living repository of the cultural traditions and thinking of medieval civilisation, and that only the responsibility, skills and interdisciplinary erudition of the academic community are able to put them to good use for the benefit of the present and future of mankind, and not turn them into a dead bequest without identity or meaning.

Haskins's passion and energy for establishing and exemplifying some of the new intellectual pillars is eloquently reflected in the volume *Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins* (1929), put together by his disciples as a tribute to his four decades as a university professor. Amongst the 18 contributions compiled, we find the names of some pupils who became eminent scholars in the field of medieval history and whose interests and creative works reflect the inspiration and inheritance they received from their master⁵⁹.

In the Master's Wake

Until the arrival of the German professors in the mid-1930s —Kantorowicz, Mommsen and Panofsky, to mention but a few⁶⁰— the American school of medievalists was dominated by Haskins's disciples or contemporaries, who had a view of history similar to his. Indeed, the Medieval Academy of America had been founded by them in 1925, publishing the first issue of *Speculum*⁶¹, the first of the scientific publications devoted to medieval history in America, one year later.

Before the decade was out, in 1928, Haskins met the man who was to be his great disciple, Joseph Reese Strayer (1904-1987), a graduate of Princeton and a member of a German family from Pennsylvania whose father had already had a long teaching career at Columbia's Teachers College. Strayer's university activity began in parallel to his relationship and friendship with Haskins, and he eventually came to set up, through his efforts, the most important and active Department of European History in the country.

Strayer continued along the path opened up by Haskins⁶² and published a large collection of books and numerous articles. Notable amongst them are *The Administration of Normandy Under Saint Louis* (1932), a continuation of Haskins's *Norman Institutions*; the well-known textbook *The Middle Ages* (1942), written in

⁵⁸ Haskins, *Studies in Mediaeval Culture*, p. vii.

⁵⁹ *Haskins Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History*, ed. by Charles H. Taylor (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1929).

⁶⁰ The Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton was founded in 1932 as a refuge for Albert Einstein and other German Jewish professors.

⁶¹ Edward Kennard Rand, 'Editor's Preface', *Speculum*, 1 (1926), 3-4.

⁶² Strayer also played a part in a number of political initiatives in his country, though of a different nature than Haskins, as he worked for the CIA under the supervision of Allen Dulles, a Princeton student.

collaboration with Dana Carleton Munro, also a professor at Princeton in the 1920s; a brilliant political history of Europe from the year 395 to 1500 entitled *Feudalism* (1965); an essay on the political sociology of the medieval government, *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State* (1970), which earned him the presidency of the Mediaeval Academy of America; *The Albigensian Crusade* (1972); and *The Reign of Philip the Fair* (1980), fruit of 30 years of research on how one of the most paradigmatic and influential governments in western Europe operated.

When he was approaching 50, Strayer directed a magnum opus commissioned by the academy that he was later to preside over, the objective of the work being to go into greater detail on *The English Government at Work*. Another of the major works he directed deals with the history of the crusades, edited in the 1950s and 60s.

It does not seem necessary, in view of the titles published by Strayer, to stress the fact that for both Haskins and his most outstanding disciple, the rise in the centralisation of power in the 12th century in France—through the creation of a legal order, above all, thanks to the revitalisation of a body of Roman law based on the principles of equity, rationality and absolutism—and centralised society were key to the history of Europe.

The main methodology and themes pursued by Strayer (royal administration, political organisation and the medieval origins of the modern state) were the showcase of American medieval historiography until the 1960s, at which time the social history of *Annales* and similar ideologies were incorporated through the work of a number of historians including the modernists Lawrence Stone and Natalie Zemon Davis, who became president of the American Historical Association. Nevertheless, despite the fashions in history studies, the school created by Haskins and Strayer continues to show the way and set the standards for the work of American medievalists, and there can be no doubt in the minds of those who reflect on their legacy that it represents the purest ideological and political tradition of the United States.

The American school itself values highly the labours of both historians, in particular that of Haskins. There are still those, such as William C. Jordan (Princeton), Bennet Hill (Georgetown University) and Thomas N. Bisson, a disciple of Strayer's (Harvard University), who continue to follow in their footsteps, and the potential of their vision of history has gradually grown through the addition of new contributions, such as Michael T. Clanchy's book *From Memory to Written Record* (1979).

Closing Reflections

"Vigorous and progressive in his method of teaching history both as a liberal art and as a human science, a sovereign influence on all advanced students of history, since all took one or more of these courses, powerful in Faculty debates, unravelling Gordian knots as quickly as others could cut them, marked out for a college president from the start, though not tempted by several important invitations to such an office, witty and gay in conversation, fond of long walks, a favorite at his clubs, best of friends, deeply reverential and religious at heart, he made himself one of the indispensables in the life of Harvard and left a name to be recorded among its greatest".⁶³

⁶³ Blake, Coffman and Rand, "Obituary note", p. 414.

Three of Haskins' colleagues described him with these words of praise, a man who, through his Chair at Harvard, reached a prominent position, thanks not only to his force of personality, but also because he achieved success in the noble but difficult calling of teaching and passing on his profound knowledge and solid qualities as a researcher. Nevertheless, we should remember him, not just as a great medievalist, but as a man who had a crucial influence on the evolution of university education and on the development of American foreign policy.

To a certain extent, Haskins improved the standards of the great schools of art and science that stretched from Cambridge via Chicago, Urbana and Madison to Berkeley (California), as at that time universities in America could not be compared with those in Europe. In the case of Harvard, he raised its prestige by encouraging interdisciplinary studies and promoting debates on the nature and direction of American education⁶⁴. Indeed, during the First World War, he taught courses on western civilisation with the intention of explaining the influence of the European legacy on the history and institutions of America, adapting at an intellectual level the study of the origins of the modern state and medieval political and administrative experience to the liberal ideology and politics of the 20th century⁶⁵, as if medieval history were, bearing in mind all the necessary precautions and qualifications, the projection of Wilsonian ideals.

The influence of democratic liberalism cannot be the main thread or grounds of any analysis of his work and vision of history, as Norman F. Cantor believes, as this may mask his significance as far as American medievalism is concerned ("If Adams was the first to teach medieval history professionally in America, Haskins was America's true professional medieval historian")⁶⁶, nor should we forget that he was able to bring together the old tradition of history in his country, which was erudite and based on Romantic notions of nationalism, with German methodology, thereby contributing "more than anyone in recent years (1937) to give a much-needed sense of value of discipline and direction to the study of History in America"⁶⁷.

In short, Haskins was an outstanding historian who combined the qualities of a great teacher with those of a skilled man of his times. We can, without fear of exaggeration, say in the words of the French medievalist F. Joûon des Longrais that "Charles Homer Haskins was truly the soul of the rebirth of medieval studies in the United States."

Chronology

1870. Charles Homer Haskins is born in Meadville (Pennsylvania).

1887-1890. First long stay in Europe, under the supervision of Ferdinand Lot and Charles V. Langlois.

1890. He receives his Ph.D. in American History from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore (Maryland).

1891. He publishes his first study, *The Yazoo Land Companies*.

1902. He takes up the post of Professor at Harvard University.

⁶⁴ Vaughn, pp. 175-176.

⁶⁵ Spiegel, pp. 64-66.

⁶⁶ Spiegel, p. 62.

⁶⁷ Powicke, p. 656.

1912. He marries Clare Allen, a teacher of Romance languages.
1915. He publishes *The Normans in European History*.
1918. *Norman Institutions* is published.
1919-1920. He is a member of the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference. He is the President of the Western European Division covering the Saar Basin, Alsace-Lorraine, Belgium and Schleswig-Holstein.
1922. He is President of the American Historical Association.
1923. *The Rise of the Universities* is published.
1924. His book *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* is published.
1926. He is President of the Mediaeval Academy of America
1928. His most important work, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, is published.
1929. He publishes his miscellany *Studies in Mediaeval Culture*.
1937. He dies on 14 May.

Selected Bibliography

Mention must first be made of Haskins' unpublished papers and correspondence at the Mudd Library, Princeton University. Other unpublished documentation is also to be found in the collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society and amongst the papers of Frederick J. Turner in the Huntington Library, as well as amongst the letters of Woodrow Wilson.

Of the various printed publications, special mention must be made of George W. Robinson's 'Bibliography of Charles Homer Haskins' in *Haskins Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History*, edited by Charles H. Taylor (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1929), 389-398.

1. Books

- A History of Higher Education in Pennsylvania* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902) (with William I. Hunt).
The Historical Curriculum in Colleges (New York; Knickerbocker, 1904).
The Normans in European History (Boston: Houghton, 1915).
Norman Institutions (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1918).
Some Problems about the Conference of Peace (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920) (with Robert H. Lord).
The Rise of the Universities (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1923).
Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1924).
The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927).
Studies in Mediaeval Culture (Oxfords: Clarendon, 1929).
Haskins Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History, ed. by Charles H. Taylor (Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1929).

2. Articles

- 'The Yazoo land companies', *Papers of the American Historical Association*, 5 (1891), 59-103.
'The Vatican Archives', *American Historical Review*, 2 (1896), 40-58.
'The Vatican Archives', *Catholic University Bulletin*, 3 (1897), 177-196.
'The life of medieval students as illustrated by their letters', *American Historical Review*, 3 (1898), 203-229.
'The study of History in schools, being the report to the American Historical Association by the Committee of seven', in *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1898* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1899), 474-564 (with others).

- 'Robert le Bougre and the beginnings of the Inquisition in Northern France', *American Historical Review*, 7 (1902), 631-652.
- 'The early Norman Jury', *American Historical Review*, 8 (1903), 613-640.
- 'The University of Paris in the sermons of the thirteenth century', *American Historical Review*, 10 (1904), 1-27.
- 'The sources for the History of the Papal Penitentiary', *American Journal of Theology*, 9 (1905), 421-450.
- 'Report of the Conference on the first year of College Work in History', in *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1905* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1906), 147-174.
- 'Knight-Service in Normandy in the eleventh century', *English Historical Review*, 22 (1907), 636-649.
- 'The Norman *Consuetudines et Iusticie* of William the Conqueror', *English Historical Review*, 23 (1908), 502-508.
- 'Normandy under William the Conqueror', *American Historical Review*, 14 (1909), 453-476.
- 'The administration of Normandy under Henry I', *English Historical Review*, 24 (1909), 209-231.
- 'A list of text-books from the close of the twelfth century', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 20 (1909), 75-94.
- 'A Canterbury monk at Constantinople, c. 1090', *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), 293-295.
- 'The translations of Hugo Sanctelliensis', *Romanic Review*, 2 (1911), 1-15.
- 'Abelard of Bath', *English Historical Review*, 26 (1911), 491-498.
- 'England and Sicily in the twelfth century', *English Historical Review*, 26 (1911), 433-447, 641-665.
- 'The study of History in Secondary Schools: Report of the Committee of Five', in *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1910* (New York: Macmillan, 1911), 209-242 (with others).
- 'History - As a College and University Study', in *A Cyclopaedia of Education*, ed. by Paul Monroe, vol. 3 (New York: Macmillan, 1911-13), 282-288.
- 'The Abacus and the King's Curia', *English Historical Review*, 27 (1912), 101-106.
- 'Normandy under Geoffrey Plantagenet', *English Historical Review*, 27 (1912), 417-444.
- 'Quelques problèmes de l'histoire des institutions anglo-normandes', in *Compte rendu des travaux du Congrès du Millénaire de la Normandie*, 1 (1912), 562-570.
- 'The Manor of Postwood under Henry I', in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à M. Charles Bémont* (Paris: Alcan, 1913), pp. 78-83.
- 'Abelard of Bath and Henry Plantagenet', *English Historical Review*, 28 (1913), 515-516.
- 'Nimrod the Astronomer', *Romanic Review*, 5 (1914), 203-212.
- 'Moses of Bergamo', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 23 (1914), 133-142.
- 'The Government of Normandy under Henry II', *American Historical Review*, 20 (1914-1915), 24-42, 277-291.
- 'Mediaeval Versions of the posterior analytics', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 25 (1914), 87-105.
- 'The reception of Arabic science in England', *English Historical Review*, 30 (1915), 56-69.
- 'The place of newer humanities in the college curriculum', in *The American College* (New York: Holt, 1915), 41-57.
- 'The materials for the reign of Robert I of Normandy', *English Historical Review*, 31 (1916), 257-268.
- 'A charter of Canute for Fécamp', *English Historical Review*, 33 (1918), 342-344.
- 'Le moyen âge français aux États-Unis', *Revue de synthèse historique*, 29 (1919), 251-256.
- 'L'histoire de France aux États-Unis', *Revue de Paris*, 27 (1920), 654-672.
- 'The Greek element in the Renaissance of the twelfth century', *American Historical Review*, 25 (1920), 603-615.

- 'The *De Arte Venandi cum Avibus* of emperor Frederick II', *English Historical Review*, 36 (1921), 334-355.
- 'Michael Scot and Frederick II', *Isis*, 4 (1921), 250-275.
- 'Some early treatises on Falconry', *Romanic Review*, 13 (1922), 18-27.
- 'Science at the court of emperor Frederick II', *American Historical Review*, 27 (1922), 669-694.
- 'King Harald's books', *English Historical Review*, 37 (1922), 398-400.
- 'European History and American Scholarship', *American Historical Review*, 28 (1923), 215-227.
- 'Two roman formularies in Philadelphia', *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, 4 (1924), 275-286.
- 'Arabic science in western Europe', *Isis*, 7 (1925), 478-485.
- 'Magister Gualterius Esculanus', in *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge offerts à M. Ferdinand Lot* (Paris: Champion, 1925), 345-257.
- 'Henry II as patron of Literature', in *Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout*, ed. by Andrew G. Little and Frederick M. Powicke (Manchester: Privately printed, 1925), 71-77.
- 'The spread of ideas in the middle ages', *Speculum*, 1 (1926), 19-30.
- 'An early Bolognese formulary', in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne* (Brussels: Vromant, 1926), pp. 201-210.
- 'Pascalis Romanus: Petrus Chrysolanus', *Byzantion*, 2 (1926), 231-236.
- 'An Italian master Bernard', in *Essays in History presented to Reginald Lane Poole*, ed. by Henry W. C. Davis (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927), pp. 221-226.
- 'The latin literature of sport', *Speculum*, 2 (1927), 235-252.
- 'The *Alchemy* ascribed to Michael Scot', *Isis*, 10 (1928), 350-359.
- 'Latin literature under Frederick II', *Speculum*, 3 (1928), 129-151.
- 'Formularies of the Officialite of Rouen', in *Mélanges Paul Fournier* (Paris: Sirey, 1929), pp. 359-362.
- 'The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences', in *The Development of Harvard University since the inauguration of president Eliot, 1869-1929*, ed. by Samuel Eliot Morison (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930), pp. 451-462.

3. Publications about Charles H. Haskins

- What Really Happened at Paris. The Story of the Peace Conference, 1918-1919*, ed. by Edward M. House and Charles Seymour (New York: Scribner, 1921).
- Frederick M. Powicke, 'Charles Homer Haskins', *English Historical Review*, 52 (1937), 649-656.
- William E. Lingelbach, 'Charles Homer Haskins', in *The American Philosophical Society Year Book, 1937* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1938), 356-357.
- R.P. Blake, George R. Coffman and Edward K. Rand, 'Obituary note. Charles Homer Haskins', *Speculum*, 14 (1939), 413-415.
- Inga Floto, *Colonel House in Paris. A Study of American Policy at the Paris Peace Conference 1919* (Copenhagen: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1973).
- Sally Vaughn, 'Charles Homer Haskins', in *Dictionary of literary Biography*, vol. 47 (Detroit: Gale, 1985), 122-144.
- Arthur Walworth, *Wilson and his peacemakers. American Diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919* (London: Norton, 1986).
- Sally Vaughn, 'Charles Homer Haskins (1870-1937)', in *Medieval Scholarships. Biographical studies on the formation of a discipline*, ed. by Helen Damico and Joseph B. Zavadil (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1995), 169-184.

Etienne Gilson (1884 – 1978)

Alessandro GHISALBERTI

(Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano)

Né à Paris en 1884 et mort à Cravant en 1978, Etienne Gilson est certainement le principal représentant international du monde des études d'histoire de la philosophie médiévale de tout le XX-ème siècle. Gilson est arrivé à ses géniales reconstructions historiographiques grâce à la découverte de la « méthode réaliste », cueillie opérativement dans la gnoséologie thomiste, où la connaissance n'a pas la priorité sur l'être, comme le veut l'idéalisme, mais est activée par l'être, dans une unité vécue et expérimentée de sujet connaissant et d'objet connu; la connaissance se laisse conditionner, de manière consciente et intelligente, par l'être du réel.

L'engagement théorique, exposé par Gilson dans l'acquisition de la méthode, l'a constamment motivé dans la défense de la légitimité de la « philosophie chrétienne », qui demande un engagement incessant dans la recherche de la notion de théologie, comme il le déclare lui-même en présentant l'autobiographie intellectuelle écrite quand il avait déjà 76 ans, *Le philosophe et la théologie* (1960): « Le sujet propre du livre est l'aventure d'un jeune Français élevé dans la religion catholique, redevable de toute son éducation à l'Eglise et de toute sa formation philosophique à l'Université, mis par Clio aux prises avec le problème de trouver un sens précis à la notion de théologie, consumant une partie de sa vie dans la discussion de ce problème et trouvant la réponse trop tard pour qu'elle pût encore lui servir »¹.

La découverte de l'originalité théorique de la Scolastique

C'est à Gilson, historien de la philosophie, que l'on doit la découverte d'un continent philosophique, celui de l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale. Au cours de ses années d'études à la Sorbonne, la conviction positiviste était encore fort répandue, qui voulait que l'histoire de la philosophie, comme celle de la science, se divise en deux époques: l'ancienne et la moderne. Entre les Grecs et Descartes, il existait une nuit intellectuelle, dans laquelle les théologiens avaient totalement sacrifié la recherche rationnelle à l'acte de foi. Ce fut dans cette conjoncture que Lucien Lévy-Bruhl confia au jeune étudiant Gilson une étude à titre d'exercice scolaire, destinée à distinguer quelque lien possible entre Descartes et la scolastique.

C'est justement à l'occasion de ses recherches pour cette étude que Gilson rencontra pour la première fois Thomas d'Aquin et d'autres théologiens scolastiques, et qu'il découvrit qu'une quantité importante de notions et de conclusions étaient passées de leurs oeuvres dans celles de Descartes. Et, plus important encore, il s'aperçut que de nombreuses doctrines scolastiques avaient été dévirilisées pour passer, privées de solidité et d'efficacité, à la philosophie moderne².

¹ Etienne Gilson, *Le philosophe et la théologie* (Paris: Fayard, 1960), pp. 9-10.

² Gilson, *Le philosophe et la théologie*, 98-99.

Une nouvelle perspective historique se présenta avec force à l'esprit de Gilson : il avait existé une pensée médiévale autonome, originale, dans laquelle les personnages n'avaient rien à envier, par certains côtés, à Descartes. Une autre question se présenta immédiatement : la pensée grecque, celle d'Aristote en particulier, était-elle passée sans altération à travers les maîtres du Moyen-Age, ou bien avait-elle subi des modifications ? Dès la première relecture, Gilson se persuada que la philosophie grecque était sortie du Moyen-Age différente de ce qu'elle était lorsqu'elle y était entrée et que, loin de poursuivre la pensée grecque comme s'il n'y avait rien eu entre elle et lui, Descartes était arrivé après le Moyen-Age presque comme si les Grecs n'avaient jamais existé³. Il s'était opéré une profonde transformation de la philosophie, à cause de la théologie chrétienne, et cette théologie ne s'était pas limitée à contenir de la métaphysique ; elle en avait produit une nouvelle.

Pour asseoir cette conviction sur des bases solides, Gilson affronta l'étude directe des auteurs, et commença par Saint Thomas : une lecture attentive des textes et une critique intelligente portèrent à la publication du volume *Le Thomisme* (1919), parvenu en 1972 à sa sixième édition revue et élargie, dans laquelle l'auteur exposait la thèse de l'existence d'une « philosophie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin ». Les premiers à réagir contre cette thèse furent les thomistes de l'époque, qui étaient essentiellement convaincus que la pensée de Thomas était commune avec celle des autres théologies médiévales. Plus précisément, on croyait que la synthèse scolastique était, dans sa substance, une adaptation homogène de la technique intellectuelle d'Aristote, un aristotélisme subsumé par la théologie chrétienne. Pour prouver la valeur de sa thèse, Gilson n'eut d'autre choix que d'entreprendre une étude comparative avec les autres scolastiques : c'est ainsi que naquit *La philosophie de Saint Bonaventure* (1924), d'où ressortait de manière évidente les différences entre les doctrines de Bonaventure et celles de Thomas, dans la mesure où, au sein des deux spéculations, on découvrait des divergences profondes quant aux notions d'être, de cause, d'intellect et de connaissance naturelle. Entre-temps, Gilson avait publié en 1922 *La philosophie au Moyen-Age*, une histoire globale de la philosophie médiévale, qui documentait irréfutablement la floraison de différentes philosophies au cours du Moyen-Age, en particulier au sein de la scolastique latine. Les objections aux thèses gilsoniennes ne manquèrent pas : P. Mandonnet reconnaissait que Thomas avait été un philosophe, mais contestait le fait que la pensée de Bonaventure fût une philosophie ; en dehors de Thomas, les autres médiévaux n'avaient été que des théologiens. A son tour, P. Théry non seulement était convaincu que la doctrine de saint Bonaventure était une théologie, mais soutenait que la théologie bonaventurienne était identique à celle de Thomas d'Aquin.

Gilson répondit par des années de nouvelles recherches, plus particulièrement centrées sur les thèses de Thomas : il reconnut comme fondamentalement vraie l'affirmation selon laquelle Saint Thomas était avant tout un théologien, mais ceci lui permit d'acquérir une autre conviction, celle que la notion de théologie n'exclut pas la philosophie.

Que Thomas ait été un théologien est évident avant tout parce que ses oeuvres fondamentales sont théologiques, alors que celles de type spécifiquement philosophique sont vues comme des études subsidiaires à la recherche théologique. Saint Thomas lui-même, dans ses *Sommes*, se considérait un *magister in sacra pagina*, un

³ Gilson, *Le philosophe et la théologie*, 101.

maître de théologie. Au sein de la théologie, Gilson découvre une philosophie propre à Thomas, étant donné qu'il est naturel en théologie de faire continuellement et librement appel au raisonnement philosophique. Ses contemporains appelaient Thomas *philosophans theologus*, un philosophe qui est au service du théologien. En faisant sortir les thèmes philosophiques de Thomas des divers contextes théologiques, on court le risque de priver sa philosophie d'originalité, parce que cette dernière n'a pas été élaborée à des fins purement philosophiques. Gilson trouve emblématique cette déclaration de la *Summa contra Gentiles*: "nous nous efforcerons avant tout de manifester cette vérité qui avait été professée par la foi et est étudiée par la raison, en apportant en même temps des raisonnements démonstratifs et des raisonnements probables, dont certains ont été recueillis par nous dans les livres des philosophes et des saints, afin que la vérité soit confirmée et l'adversaire convaincu"⁴.

Le résultat de cette opération est certainement théologique, même s'il apparaît clairement que la raison entre de plein droit dans l'explication de l'élément de foi; cela a entraîné la dilatation de la théologie métaphysique et un ordonnancement qui lui est particulier de la théologie révélée: "Si Saint Thomas s'était contenté de dire que la métaphysique et la théologie naturelle s'ordonnent à la théologie du révélé comme à leur fin, sa conclusion n'intéresserait qu'indirectement l'histoire de la philosophie. Mais il est allé bien plus loin. En affirmant que la "philosophie première" elle-même est entièrement ordonnée à la connaissance de Dieu comme à sa fin, c'est justement à la connaissance de Dieu à travers la raison naturelle qu'il pense avant tout. Les mots qui terminent sa phrase suffisent à le prouver: *unde et scientia divina nominatur*. C'est donc justement la *prima philosophia* elle-même, ou métaphysique, qui devient théologie en s'ordonnant à la connaissance de Dieu. S'il en est ainsi, toute la métaphysique se trouve centrée, au delà de la connaissance de l'essence la plus universelle de toutes, celle de l'être en tant qu'être, sur *un être* dont on peut dire au contraire qu'il est éminemment singulier [...].

Le terme "théologie" ne désignait pour Aristote qu'une science à peine accessible et misérablement limitée, parce que nous sommes devant son objet comme l'oiseau de nuit devant le soleil. Pour Saint Thomas, la théologie prenait une consistance et une plénitude tout autres du fait que, Dieu ayant parlé, elle pouvait se constituer, à partir de la révélation, comme une science de la foi. Sans doute, même alors, on doit encore parler de la théologie comme de "ce peu que nous savons de Dieu", mais, d'abord, parce qu'elle se fonde désormais sur la foi, sa certitude est devenue inébranlable, ce qui constitue une première différence d'importance capitale; et, en outre, parce qu'elle est désormais science du salut, elle est devenue la fin vitalement urgente de toute la spéculation humaine"⁵.

L'actualité de l'être selon Thomas d'Aquin

Gilson place la métaphysique thomiste au croisement de deux conceptions de l'être, l'essentialiste et l'existentialiste. En se fondant sur un concept de l'être qui comprend en soi aussi bien l'essence que l'existence, celle-ci dépasse, dans une

⁴ Thomas d'Aquin, *Summa contra Gentiles*, I, 9.

⁵ E. Gilson, *L'être et l'essence* (Paris: Vrin, 1962), pp. 89-90.

synthèse supérieure, les philosophies de l'essence (essentialisme) et les philosophies de l'existence (existentialisme).

L'essentialisme, tout comme l'existentialisme, sont des abstractions: le premier naît du besoin de l'homme de transformer le chaos en cosmos, d'organiser la réalité selon des concepts totalement rationnels; le deuxième naît pour revendiquer l'existence à l'égard de l'essence; mais, en se limitant à l'expérience de l'existence, il ne parvient pas à avoir une connaissance objective de l'être. Gilson précise: "De même que l'essentialisme est une philosophie de l'être moins l'existence, l'existentialisme est une philosophie de l'être moins l'essence"⁶.

La solution non réductionniste du réel est celle de Saint Thomas d'Aquin, qui a cherché dans l'être existant la source unique de l'essence et de l'individuel. Saint Thomas, en cohérence avec sa méthode, a posé le problème de la composition de l'*ens* au niveau d'être réel. Il ne l'a pas posé au niveau logique, c'est à dire au niveau de *ens commune*, parce que l'*ens commune* est un universel, une entité de "deuxième intention", sans aucune réalité propre, sinon celle d'objet connu de notre intellect.

Tous les êtres réels se soumettent à une distinction fondamentale: celle entre l'être nécessaire ou Dieu, et l'être contingent ou création. Dieu est l'acte pur d'être, et en lui l'essence coïncide avec l'existence. Chacun des autres êtres, au contraire, est un acte d'être, qualifié et déterminé à être "comme être" par une essence qui s'y ajoute. Il existe donc une distinction radicale entre Dieu, dont l'essence est son être même, et les autres êtres, qui sont seulement parce que leurs essences respectives *ont* chacune un être qu'elles ne *sont* pas.

La nécessité de composition d'essence et existence chez les êtres créés ressort de la constatation que l'être créé est un être fini et qu'il possède l'être "en partie". "On est donc conduit, pour rendre raison des existants finis donnés dans l'expérience, à concevoir chacun d'eux comme composé de "ce qu'il est" (sa substance ou essence), et de l'acte d'exister, ou *esse*, en vertu duquel cette substance ou essence existe"⁷.

Il s'agit d'infléchir l'enquête spéculative depuis la simple réalité logique de l'essence à l'*ens* dans toute son épaisseur d'unité dans la diversité⁸.

Dans le volume *Le thomisme*, Gilson explique: "en s'élevant jusqu'à l'acte d'exister, il voit d'un seul coup d'oeil en quoi l'essence et l'existence se distinguent, en quoi elles s'unissent dans la réalité. Elles se distinguent, car ce n'est pas dans l'essence que gît la racine de l'exister et l'exister lui-même domine l'essence dont il est l'acte. Elles sont étroitement unies pourtant, car si l'essence ne contient pas l'exister, elle y est contenue, si bien que l'existence est en lui ce qu'il y a de plus intime et de plus profond. Avicenne et Averroès se contredisent parce qu'ils se tiennent sur le même plan. Saint Thomas ne contredit ni l'un ni l'autre, il les dépasse, en allant jusqu'à la racine même de l'être, l'*actus essendi*, l'*ipsum esse*"⁹.

⁶ Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, 301.

⁷ Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, 116.

⁸ L'essence qui existe pour elle-même, de manière autarchique, a une existence purement abstraite; un acte d'exister fini, détaché de toute essence, est contradictoire ou simplement impensable. Cf. Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, 121.

⁹ E. Gilson, *Le thomisme. Introduction à l'étude de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* [1^{re} éd. Paris : J. Vrin, 1922] (Paris, 1972), 183.

Thomas affirme que dans l'être réel sont impliqués deux principes métaphysiques, intrinsèquement unis, qui ne donnent pas lieu à deux réalités autonomes. C'est justement parce que l'essence et l'existence s'interpénètrent ontologiquement que leur unité se situe au niveau métaphysique et non dans l'ordre physique du rapport de parties à l'intérieur d'un tout matériel¹⁰. Lorsqu'il se réfère à des liens intercurrents entre l'essence et l'existence, afin l'éviter l'équivoque d'une interprétation physicienne des éléments constitutifs de l'*ens*, Thomas préfère le terme de *composition* à celui de *distinction*¹¹.

Gilson commente: "La notion complète d'être inclut à la fois l'existence (*esse*) et quelque chose qui existe (substance). Tout être, au sens plein du terme, exige donc la co-présence de ces deux éléments, donc leur distinction réelle, et par conséquent enfin leur composition réelle. Si leur composition n'était pas réelle, c'est-à-dire si l'*esse* n'était pas *aliud* que l'*id quod est*, comme toutes les substances de même espèce ont même quiddité, l'*esse* de l'une serait le même que celui des autres, elles ne pourraient pas se distinguer. La distinction et la composition de l'*esse* et de l'*id quod est* est donc aussi réelle que celle qui distingue les uns des autres les sujets réellement existants"¹².

Saint Thomas approfondit l'union de l'essence et de l'être en se servant de la théorie aristotélicienne de l'acte et de la puissance: comme l'acte et la puissance ne peuvent pas exister indépendamment l'un de l'autre, il en est ainsi pour l'essence et l'existence; la puissance est à l'acte ce que l'essence est à l'existence. Le binôme acte et pouvoir avait été reconduit par Aristote à la relation entre forme et matière; la composition de la substance avec son acte d'exister et la composition de matière et de forme se ressemblent, mais diffèrent également, et ne sont donc pas deux compositions du même ordre¹³.

Aristote parlait d' "acte" seulement à propos de la forme, parce qu'il interprétait le réel en fonction de la substance. Thomas d'Aquin, au contraire, lit le réel concret en fonction de l'*ens* et voit la forme "comme un *quo est* secondaire, subordonné à ce *quo est* premier qui est l'acte même d'exister"¹⁴.

Thomas d'Aquin dit que les formes par rapport à l'exister auquel elles participent sont "en quelque sorte" en puissance et, en ce qui concerne le rôle déterminateur de l'*esse*, il affirme qu'il est acte, mais aussi parfois qu'il est l'"actualité" des formes et des essences, et même qu'il est "formel" à l'égard de tous les autres éléments du réel¹⁵.

¹⁰ Gilson, *Le thomisme*, 177.

¹¹ Gilson dit: "La formule la plus usitée parle de *distinction* d'essence et d'existence, mais saint Thomas lui-même emploie plus volontiers le mot *composition*, sans doute parce qu'en fait, l'*essentia* et son *esse* ne peuvent jamais être données à part. Ils composent ensemble sans avoir existé à l'état séparé". Gilson, *Le thomisme*, 177, note 56). Cf. également Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, 107.

¹² Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, 106.

¹³ "Un premier point que nous avons déjà signalé, mais où nous devons revenir parce que saint Thomas y revient lui-même sans cesse, est que ces deux compositions, et par conséquent ces deux distinctions, se ressemblent sous un certain rapport mais diffèrent profondément sous un autre. Elles se ressemblent en ceci, que toutes deux sont des compositions d'acte et de puissance, c'est-à-dire d'un déterminant et d'un déterminé, elles diffèrent en ceci, que la composition constitutive de la substance corporelle est celle de l'acte de la forme avec la puissance de la matière au lieu que la composition constitutive de l'être existant est celle de l'acte de l'*esse* avec la substance même, prise comme déjà constituée ainsi qu'il vient d'être dit, mais encore en puissance à l'égard de l'exister" (Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, p. 108).

¹⁴ Gilson, *Le thomisme*, 174.

¹⁵ Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, 110-111.

En conséquence, Gilson synthétise ainsi la position de Thomas sur l'*ens*: "Le rapport de l'exister à l'essence se présente donc comme celui d'un acte qui n'est pas une forme, à une potentialité qui n'est pas une matière, c'est-à-dire à une certaine forme de potentialité"¹⁶.

L'*esse* confère l'acte existentiel à la forme ou essence; la forme détermine dans l'ordre essentiel l'acte même qui la fait exister. Dans cette dialectique de détermination réciproque, le primat revient à l'acte d'exister, dans la mesure où, sans lui, il n'y aurait ni essence ni existence, autrement dit l'être ne trouve pas l'ultime explication de son être dans son essence. L'être est une essence qui est réalisée par l'*actus essendi*. La mise en relief de l'acte d'exister est le fruit le plus consistant de la philosophie réaliste de Saint Thomas; c'est la conséquence logique de l'application rigoureuse de la méthode réaliste. Donc, ce qui est valable à propos du rapport entre méthode réaliste et *ens*, est valable également pour ce qui concerne la méthode réaliste et l'*actus essendi*: l'acte d'exister doit être cueilli en corrélation avec la méthode réaliste et la méthode réaliste en corrélation avec l'acte d'exister¹⁷.

Dans *Eléments de philosophie chrétienne*, le médiéviste français se demande comment Thomas d'Aquin est parvenu à découvrir la simple possibilité de la notion de l'acte d'exister, et écrit: "Il est certain que celle-ci dérive d'un suprême effort d'abstraction, dans la mesure où pour la formuler, l'intellect doit concevoir, séparément de la condition d'être un existant, l'acte en fonction duquel l'existant se trouve dans cette condition: *ipsum esse significatur ut quoddam abstractum*. Or, évidemment, abstraire cette notion de celle de substance et la distinguer de celle d'essence équivaut précisément à la créer"¹⁸.

La notion d'être comme acte d'exister, et donc non pas l'être selon une modalité qui lui est spécifique, mais selon ce qui le constitue plus parfaitement comme tel, est pour Gilson la découverte originale de Saint Thomas, en vertu de laquelle l'ontologie thomiste s'impose par rapport à toutes les autres ontologies.

Le cri d'amour d'Héloïse

Au cours de l'année universitaire 1936-37, Etienne Gilson inscrit au programme des cours du Collège de France une série de leçons sur *Les origines médiévales de l'Humanisme*; c'est ainsi, comme il le dit lui-même, qu'il rencontra Abélard. Il fut cependant fort surpris, avouera-t-il ensuite, de devoir prêter autant d'attention à Héloïse qu'à Abélard lui-même et, une fois entré dans leur histoire, d'avoir autant de peine à s'en détacher. De ces leçons naquit le célèbre volume *Héloïse et Abélard*, dont la première édition fut publiée chez Vrin, à Paris, en 1938; il y est reconstruit l'histoire profondément humaine des deux célèbres amants, sur la base de l'autobiographie (intitulée *Historia calamitatum mearum*) d'Abélard lui-même, et des lettres (d'Héloïse à Abélard et d'Abélard à Héloïse).

L'histoire est connue: mais en disant qu'il s'agit d'une histoire connue, je me rends compte qu'elle l'est devenue grâce au livre de Gilson, à la reconstruction des données historiques et littéraires qu'il a conduite d'une main de maître, en la

¹⁶ Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, 111.

¹⁷ Gilson, *Le thomisme*, 455.

¹⁸ *Elementi di filosofia cristiana* (Brescia : Morcelliana, 1964), pp. 184-185. (La citation dans le texte est une re-traduction en français de la traduction italienne. N. du T.)

délivrant des visions légendaires et purement fantaisistes diffusées à l'âge moderne. Commencée comme un banal épisode de séduction d'une jeune fille, même si "déjà célèbre pour l'étendue de sa culture littéraire", de la part de son maître, l'histoire d'Abélard et Héloïse se révèle ensuite, à travers d'orageuses péripéties, un drame extrêmement complexe, dense d'implications éthiques, théologiques, historico-culturelles, qui entraînent chacun des protagonistes sur des chemins différents mais, en dernière instance, convergents. Tous deux finirent leur vie dans un monastère: Abélard, après la publication d'oeuvres théologiques originales, qui lui procurèrent l'aversion des théologiens de l'époque et une condamnation de la part de l'Eglise, finit ses jours à Cluny, comme un humble pénitent, et mourut dans la solitude; Héloïse devint abbesse au Paraclet, et demeura fidèle jusqu'à la fin —comme l'indiquent ses Epîtres— à ses caractéristiques de grande *amoureuse* dans le style français.

Gilson a évoqué cette histoire avec une extraordinaire finesse et, grâce à sa connaissance de l'ensemble de la culture médiévale, il a su mettre en lumière tous ses aspects. Tout en respectant son caractère spécifique, Gilson replace le drame d'Abélard et d'Héloïse dans le mouvement de renaissance pré-humaniste du XII^e siècle, et saisit l'occasion qui lui est offerte pour analyser les problèmes de la signification du Moyen-Age et de l'Humanisme, de leurs rapports, et des rapports de la philosophie chrétienne avec le naturalisme antique.

Mais ce qui frappe le lecteur, dans la monographie gilsonienne, c'est la pénétration de la psychologie d'Héloïse, l'analyse raffinée des pensées et des sentiments d'Héloïse qui se cachent derrière les mots de ses lettres.

Après avoir analysé le contenu de sa correspondance, Gilson en arrive à cette synthèse: "Héloïse est une épouse qui, engagée par Abélard dans un état de perfection religieuse dont elle n'a pas la vocation et ne sent pas la grâce, ne dispose que d'un appui naturel pour s'y maintenir: l'amour qu'elle porte à son époux"¹⁹.

C'est la fierté de cet amour, fidèlement vécu par Héloïse jusqu'à son dernier souffle, qui amène Gilson à voir en elle le symbole de la donation féminine totale et durable, qui ne se laisse pas abattre, même devant les responsabilités de la vie religieuse et les commandements de l'amour de Dieu. Les âmes sensibles s'émeuvent devant tant de richesse d'humanité, au point que notre auteur ressent le besoin de poursuivre l'histoire d'Héloïse même quand les données historiques viennent à manquer: "Héloïse survécut vingt et un ans à son ami et mourut le 16 mai 1164, ayant atteint le même âge que lui. Ici finit l'histoire et commencerait la légende. On rapporte que, peu de temps avant sa mort, Héloïse avait pris les dispositions nécessaires pour être ensevelie avec Abélard. Lorsqu'on ouvrit sa tombe et qu'on l'y déposa près de lui, il étendit les bras pour l'accueillir, et les referma étroitement sur elle. Ainsi contée, l'histoire est belle, mais, légende pour légende, on croirait plus volontiers qu'en rejoignant son ami dans la tombe, Héloïse ait ouvert les bras pour l'embrasser"²⁰.

Gilson, en passant de la légende à l'évaluation historique, exhorte les historiens de la littérature médiévale de réfléchir avant de donner leurs définitions sur le Moyen-Age et la Renaissance; il les invite à se souvenir "de cette folle petite française,

¹⁹ E. Gilson, *Héloïse et Abélard* (3^e éd. Paris : Vrin, 1964), pp. 125-126.

²⁰ Gilson, *Héloïse et Abélard*, 146.

hantée par l'idéal de la grandeur romaine comme par celui de la grandeur chrétienne, qui ne sut jamais au juste si elle était l'Eustochium d'un nouveau saint Jérôme ou la Cornélie d'un nouveau Pompée et qui, prenant le voile à Argenteuil pour l'amour d'un homme, se consacra pour toujours à Dieu en récitant des vers de la *Pharsale*. Car enfin, ce drame passionnel peuplé de clercs, de moines et de nonnes est bien une histoire du XII^e-ème siècle. On peut le lire comme une histoire chrétienne et c'en est véritablement une. Héloïse sait le latin, le grec et de l'hébreu, étudie la Bible, théologise, réclame des *Consolationes* et des *Exhortationes* comme l'avaient fait les filles spirituelles de saint Jérôme... [...]. Pourquoi Héloïse s'élève-t-elle avec un si froid dédain contre les exigences de la Règle monastique? Parce que, comme elle le fait dire par saint Paul, c'est du judaïsme; parce que, comme elle le fait dire par saint Augustin, tant d'oeuvres sont inutiles s'il est vrai que l'intention seule compte; parce que, comme elle le fait dire à Sénèque, toutes ces questions de vêtements, de boisson et de nourriture rentrent dans la classe des *indifferentia*, dont le sage ne fait pas dépendre sa sagesse. Héloïse écrit froidement ces choses en plein XII^e-ème siècle, de sa cellule d'abbesse du Paraclet, au nom de la vertu de prudence et de la raison "mère de toutes les vertus". Mais cette nouvelle Paula est également une héroïne de roman, la Nouvelle Cornélie qui prépare à son tour la Nouvelle Héloïse²¹.

Pour conclure

Un autre secteur de la discussion sur l'interprétation des auteurs médiévaux qui a recueilli de nombreuses interventions de Gilson fut le débat des années trente sur la philosophie chrétienne. Il s'agit d'une discussion qui a engagé un grand nombre d'intellectuels européens, et qui a déjà été largement reconstruite.

Nous la rappelons cependant, en conclusion de cette intervention, parce qu'elle détient en quelque sorte la capacité de nous offrir un portrait d'ensemble de Gilson en tant que protagoniste, parmi les intellectuels de son époque. Outre l'existence de fait, attestée par l'histoire de la philosophie médiévale, Gilson a également revendiqué l'existence de droit de la philosophie chrétienne: "s'il existe un chrétien qui fait de la philosophie, il existe un philosophe chrétien, et sa philosophie sera obligatoirement une philosophie chrétienne". Un philosophe chrétien ne pourra donc pas se soustraire à l'exigence de confronter ses recherches sur l'homme et sur la nature avec l'enseignement révélé.

La raison laissée à elle-même, dans certains secteurs importants de la recherche, s'avère insuffisante; en touchant à la révélation, l'homme d'un côté renonce à sa propre nature, et de l'autre, participe à l'intelligence divine, en acquérant une incomparable profondeur. Les chrétiens peuvent progresser plus encore que les autres philosophes dans la spéculation rationnelle, à condition de se rendre compte que la comparaison avec un terme immuable, c'est à dire avec la vérité qui émane de la nature de Dieu, est source de progrès et non d'obstacle dans les découvertes scientifiques, morales, économiques, politiques et artistiques.

Pour l'importante contribution que le médiéviste français a apportée, tout au long d'une existence bien remplie, au rapport entre foi chrétienne et raison, le

²¹ Gilson, *Héloïse et Abélard*, 165-166.

nom de Gilson a été à juste titre inscrit par Jean-Paul II dans la *Fides et ratio*, parmi les penseurs qui ont maintenu active une recherche courageuse sur le "rapport fécond entre la philosophie et la parole de Dieu"²².

Table chronologique

- 1884. Étienne Gilson né à Paris.
- 1913. Doctorat: *La liberté chez Descartes*.
- 1929. Foundation de l'*Institute of Mediaeval Studies* (Toronto, Le Canada).
- 1930, ss. Professeur à l'Université d'Estrasbourg; Paris-Sorbonne, Collège de France.
- 1932. Gifford lectures: *L'esprit de la philosophie médiévale*.
- 1947. Conference Albert-le-Grand: *Philosophie et incarnation, selon saint Agustin*.
- 1961-1962. *A History of Philosophy* (Directeur).
- 1962. *Modern Philosophy: Descartes to Kant; Recent Philosophy: Hegel to te Present* (avec la collaboration de Thomas Langan).

Bibliographie

1. Ouvrages à caractère historique

- Index scolastico-cartésien* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1913).
- Le thomisme. Introduction à l'étude de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (1^{ère} éd. Strasbourg: Libraires-Éditeurs, 1919; 6^{ème} éd., Paris: J. Vrin, 1972).
- La philosophie au moyen-âge*, 2 vols (1^{ère} éd. Paris: Payot et Cie, 1922 ; 2^{ème} éd. Paris: Payot, 1944).
- La philosophie de Saint Bonaventure* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1924).
- Introduction à l'étude de Saint Augustin* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1929).
- L'esprit de la philosophie médiévale* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1932).
- La théologie mystique de Saint Bernard* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1934).
- Héloïse et Abélard* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1938).
- Dante et la philosophie* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1939).
- Jean Duns Scot. Introduction à ses positions fondamentales* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1952).

2. Ouvrages à caractère théorique

- Le réalisme méthodique* (Paris: Chez Pierre Téqui, 1935?)
- Christianisme et philosophie* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1936)
- Réalisme thomiste et critique de la connaissance* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1939).
- L'être et l'essence* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1948).
- Introduction à la philosophie chrétienne* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1960).
- Le philosophe et la théologie* (Paris: Fayard, 1960).
- L'athéisme difficile* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1979), [posthume].

3. Publications sur Étienne Gilson

- Italo Mancini, 'Gilson. Forma ed esistenza', *Filosofi esistenzialisti* (Urbino: Argalia, 1964), pp. 187-248.
- Antonio Livi, *Etienne Gilson. Filosofia cristiana e idea del limite critico* (Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1970).

²² Jean-Paul II, *Fides et ratio*, § 74.

- Mario Toso, *Fede, ragione e civiltà. Saggio sul pensiero di E. Gilson* (Roma: LAS, 1986).
Laurence K. Shook, *Etienne Gilson* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1984; Milano: Jaca Book, 1991).
Battista Mondin, 'Etienne Gilson (1884-1978)', *La metafisica di S. Tommaso d'Aquino e i suoi interpreti* (Bologna: Edizioni Studio Domenicano, 2002), pp. 74-86.

Marc Bloch (1886 – 1944)

Massimo MASTROGREGORI
(Università di Roma “La Sapienza”)

History, men and time

1. History

“History is not a science”: this peremptory phrase was to be the starting point with which Marc Bloch opened a notebook of reflections in February 1906. Historical methodology, according to the author, then aged twenty, “is descriptive, chronological and in opposition to the analytical methodology peculiar to science”. The task of the nineteenth century was to find a system of historical research and a technique of carrying out the work; the critical method had reached the point of perfection. The historian, however, resembled a biologist equipped with an excellent microscope, but who was unsure of its applications¹.

The project that was to direct the whole of Bloch’s work, namely to transform history into an analytical science of social phenomena, applying the critical method to subjects worthy of study, was evident in the 1906 notebook. Even in September 1939, in the introductory pages of a book on France and the European civilisation, which he subsequently did not write, Bloch still expressed the dream of history as “a truly analytical and explanatory history, which for all that should not cease to remain faithful to the colours of life”.

It was a creative and constructive project, looking to secure the same value and dignity for history as that attributed to science. Despite its millenary course, this value and dignity had never been recognised and at that moment seemed within reach, following the prodigious progress made by history in the nineteenth century. But it was also a complex strategy in the defence of history against many irrational attacks (and not only irrational), that had been vigorous since the beginning of the century and were destined to increase with time. In France, the attack came, for example, from the “1905 Generation”, from Maurice Barrès, Henri Massis and Charles Péguy, exponents of the irrational nationalistic and Catholic reaction to the success of the new republican Sorbonne. This was both rational and secular, reformed by militant historians such as Ernest Lavisse and Alphonse Aulard. Bloch

¹ Cf. M. Bloch, ‘Méthodologie historique (février 1906)’, in *Rivista di storia della storiografia moderna*, 9 (1988), 155-168. In the footnotes, the following abbreviations have been used: AESC = *Annales. Economies, sociétés, civilisations*; AHES = *Annales d’histoire économique et sociales*; AHS = *Annales d’histoire sociale*; BH = ‘Bulletin historique. Histoire d’Allemagne, Moyen Age’, in *Revue historique*; CMB = *Cahiers Marc Bloch*; Fink = C. Fink, *Marc Bloch, a life in history* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); MH = M. Bloch, *Mélanges historiques*, ed. by Ch. E. Perrin, 2 vol. (Paris: S. Fleury-EHESS, 1983²); MHS = *Mélanges d’histoire sociale*; RSH = *Revue de synthèse historique*. The quotation of notes and reviews written by Bloch is at times given in an abbreviated form. The quotations from the correspondence between Bloch and Febvre come from the originals held by the Archives of France. For a more detailed insight into the themes of this essay, I refer the reader to my *Introduzione a Bloch* (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2001).

was born in 1886 and belonged to the last generation of the Dreyfus Affair. He had been educated in the tense and exhilarating atmosphere of discussions of a civil, political and intellectual nature concerning the trial of the Jewish Captain Dreyfus, accused of having given classified military information to the Germans, and finally exonerated, thanks in part to the intervention of historians and writers.

Up until this time, history had frequently stood accused in the European culture, but what could be considered a new element in the flood of criticism directed against history at the end of the nineteenth century was that this last attack came following the extraordinary progress in historical study in that century, and at a time when the transformation of historical research into a professional activity and the teaching of history was coming to fruition. The history that was being attacked was precisely that history that Bloch did not consider a science, namely "official history"; positivist, specialised, protected from criticism by restrictive documentary traditions and indifferent to general historical problems and the very real questions concerning contemporary culture.

Marc Bloch's historical science project was developed independently of historical materialism, idealism and historicism. It was more than a "revision" of the Romanticism, expounding a radical opposition to what remained of that movement, and a corresponding steadfast desire to develop a cultural direction independent of Romanticism, aimed above all at sociological problems. In short, Bloch's project can be described not only as anti-Romantic, but also critical of the efforts on the part of historicism (esp. in Germany and Italy) to reform the Romantic traditions. At the centre of this project, the strategy for the future and the interpretation of the past in the historical discipline, lay the critical method and historical analysis.

2. *Men*

What has been said up until now is more understandable if one looks at Bloch's circle of friends, the intellectual backdrop resulting from friendships and collaboration, institutional and professional contacts, and diverse generations of scholars. In this "constellation of characters", it is above all the men who stand out and contributed closely to Bloch's education as a historian. His father, Gustave Bloch, was to be the first among these men; an undisputed authority on Roman history in France at the beginning of the 1900s, he personally took care of his son's education in history. As an official apprentice at the faculty of mediaeval studies at the Sorbonne, Charles-Victor Langlois, and particularly Christian Pfister, played a role in this same cultural field.

Alongside the official teachers, a second group of characters stands out, comprising teachers who were less close to Bloch, scholars, friends and collaborators. Bloch's work makes substantial progress with regard to their projects; he maintains a dialogue with them, reading and discussing their written works, taking part in their initiatives and keeping up a close correspondence by letter. Henri Pirenne is the first and most important of these "long distance" teachers. He was the author of *Les Villes au Moyen Age* and *Mahomet et Charlemagne*, and the ideal model historian to whom Bloch turned for inspiration.

The work by Pirenne reorganised the traditional mode of study in an original and creative fashion, including the history of civilisation as advocated by Karl Lamprecht (*Kulturgeschichte*), but without entering into any controversy. However, a deliberately aggressive and "destructive" strategy was adopted by Emile Durkheim

and his pupils, who, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, attempted to establish sociology as an academic discipline by attacking history and geography, refusing to recognise any scientific value in either. During his formative years, Bloch did not escape from the profound cultural impact of the followers of Durkheim. The 1906 notebook, from which we followed his development, is the most eloquent witness. He adopted certain theoretical solutions from the Durkheimians, along with the style of critical intervention, particularly in reviews, but he did not favour the dismissal of history from the academic scene in favour of sociology².

Apart from the works of Durkheim himself, on a theoretical level the greatest influence on Bloch was that of François Simiand, a philosopher and economist with a scholarly interest in statistics. In his writings, Bloch was to discover the concept of historical analysis, models and hypotheses for the economic history of salaries and prices in Europe, and examples of statistical criticism³. Bloch also discovered new historical problems and innovative hypotheses in the research into collective representation by some of his student colleagues and friends belonging to the group of Durkheimians.

Among these were Georges Davy, at the time pursuing the study of oaths⁴, and Louis Gernet, who was to become an authority on the anthropological history of ancient Greece⁵. However, amongst the "researchers" of the school (as distinct from the more dogmatic Durkheimian "teachers")⁶, the closest to Bloch was without doubt Maurice Halbwachs, whom he had frequented in Strasbourg, where the two were colleagues, and who he met again in Paris in 1936⁷. Bloch continued to reflect

² Profound and balanced analyses of his relationship with Durkheim and his school in S. Friedman, *Marc Bloch, Sociology and Geography, Encountering Changing Disciplines* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), and in B. Müller, 'Marc Bloch und die Sozialwissenschaften', in *Marc Bloch, Historiker und Widerstandskämpfer*, ed. by P. Schöttler (Frankfurt: Campus, 1999), pp. 72-101.

³ Cf. Friedman, 24, 40, 50 ff. The theoretical writings of François Simiand (1873-1935) are collected in F. Simiand, *Méthode Historique et Sciences Sociales*, ed. by Marina Cedronio (Paris: Editions des Archives Contemporaines, 1987). On his thought, cf. M. Mastrogregori, 'Note su Simiand metodologo', in *Rivista Storica Italiana*, 101 (1989), 237-250; *François Simiand, Sociologie, Histoire, Économie*, ed. by L. Gillard, M. Rosier (Amsterdam: Editions des Archives Contemporaines, 1996).

⁴ Georges Davy, *La foi jurée, étude sociologique* (Paris: Alcan, 1922); persisting on the influence of Davy, P. Schöttler, 'Marc Bloch und Deutschland', in *Marc Bloch, Historiker und Widerstandskämpfer*, p. 38, and B. Müller, 'Marc Bloch und die Sozialwissenschaften', p. 80.

⁵ Cf. Louis Gernet, *I Greci senza miracolo* (Roma: Editori Riuniti, 1986); Riccardo Di Donato, *Per un'antropologia storica del mondo antico* (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1990); Friedman, 77 (also to be seen for information on Marcel Granet, another colleague of Bloch).

⁶ The distinction between Durkheimian "researchers" and "teachers" is in Friedman, 127-128 and notes. Bloch was to become an attentive reader of Marcel Mauss, who can also be counted amongst the "researchers". Cf. M. Mauss, *I fondamenti di un'antropologia storica*, ed. by R. Di Donato (Torino: Einaudi, 1998).

⁷ For the evolution of Bloch's thought, the dialogue with Maurice Halbwachs (1877-1945) was of great importance: cf. the reviews dedicated to his works in RSH, 40 (1925), 73-83 (social frameworks of the memory); AHES, 1 (1929), 434-436 (urban development of Paris); AHES, 3 (1931), 590-592 (social causes of suicide); AHES, 7 (1935), 83-86 (working class consumption); AHS, 1 (1939), 315-316 (social morphology); collaborator and committee member of the "Annales", Halbwachs reviewed in turn Bloch's *The Royal touch in Année sociologique* (1923-1924), 536-542 (a book of which Halbwachs also spoke at length with Jorge Semprun in the Buchenwald concentration camp in 1944, shortly before dying there). On his relationship with Bloch, cf. Friedman, 128-129 (on p. 217 cites unpublished critical remarks on Bloch). On Halbwachs: G. Namer, 'Postface', in M. Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1994), pp. 299-367; M. Halbwachs, *La mémoire collective* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1997); *Maurice Halbwachs, 1877-1945*, ed. by Ch. de Montlibert (Strasbourg: Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg, 1997).

on and discuss in depth Halbwachs's writings on the effect of social morphology on groups and classes, on collective memory, on suicide, and on urban history.

Another determining ambit in the development of Bloch's activity was that of Henri Berr. Berr was the founder and editor of a respected journal, the "Revue de Synthèse Historique", the French organ of the "innovators" of historiography, and the creator of an active international centre of historical studies in Paris. He was also the editor of an imposing universal history in 100 volumes, "L'Évolution de l'Humanité", and a recognised figure on the academic scene in Paris, despite never having received any university post. Berr forged ties between the young historians. He distributed strategic information on jobs and candidatures, and procured contracts with publishers. Not only were Bloch's first publications entrusted to Berr, but if we look at the books in store, from the mid-twenties on, with the exception of the conferences on rural history, Bloch worked for Berr and his "Évolution de l'Humanité", promising him two volumes on European economic history, one on the "agricultural revolution", two on feudal society (these only to be finished and published)⁸. It was, in fact, Berr who propitiated the fateful encounter between Bloch and Lucien Febvre, his right-hand man and spiritual heir.

The "presence" of Lucien Febvre in the life of Bloch was, in fact, very important: they had been colleagues and friends in Strasbourg, were joint founders of the *Annales d'Histoire Économique et Sociale*, the most renowned and much discussed historical journal of the twentieth century, a workshop of ideas and innovation and an everyday forum for dialogue (and at times dispute)⁹. In the end, it was to be Febvre who was responsible for the survival of Bloch's works after his death. None of Bloch's pupils figure amongst the men who had a profound influence on his life: out of sixty or so graduates from Strasbourg, only three were to discuss their theses with Bloch between 1919 and 1936. His few immediate followers, such as R. Boutrouche, R. Folz, Ph. Wolff and A. Déleage, became close to the master only late in the day; he participated in their work with some distance, was certainly blameless regarding the "anxiety of influence", and never attempted to close them in any "enchanted circle"¹⁰.

⁸ For essential reading on the relationship with Berr, *Écrire "La société féodale": lettres à Henri Berr, 1924-1943*, ed. by J. Pluet-Despatin (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1992), contains references to Bloch and L. Febvre, as does L. Febvre, *Lettres à Henri Berr*, ed. by G. Candar and J. Pluet-Despatin (Paris: Fayard, 1997); see also *Henri Berr et la culture du XXe siècle: histoire, science et philosophie*, ed. by A. Biard, D. Bourel, E. Brian (Paris: Albin Michel, 1997) and *Les mots de l'histoire. Le vocabulaire historique du Centre international de synthèse*, ed. by M. Platania (Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2000).

⁹ Cf. Marc Bloch, *Lucien Febvre and the "Annales d'histoire économique et sociale". Correspondance, vol. 1, La naissance des Annales, 1928-1933*, ed. by B. Müller (Paris: Fayard, 1994); vol. 2 and 3, Paris: Fayard 2004). There is no general study on the work of Febvre, apart from B. Müller, *L. Febvre lecteur et critique* (Paris: Albin Michel 2003); cf. *Bibliographie des travaux de L. Febvre*, ed. by B. Müller (Paris: A. Colin, 1990); M. Mastrogregori, *Il genio dello storico*, (Napoli: Edizioni scientifiche italiane, 1987); D. Wootton, 'L. Febvre and the problem of unbelief in the early modern period', in *Journal of modern history* 60 (1988), 695-730; P. Schöttler, 'Introduction', in Lucie Varga, *Les autorités invisibles* (Paris: Cerf, 1991) [by the same author see also the introductions to the new editions of *Il Reno* (Rom: Donzelli, 1998), and *Martin Luther* (Frankfurt: Campus, 1996)]; Peter Burke, *Una rivoluzione storiografica, La scuola delle "Annales", 1929-1989* (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1992); B. Müller, 'L. Febvre et l'histoire régionale', in *Rivista di storia della storiografia moderna*, 14 (1993), 23-41; M. Wessel, 'Les combats pour l'histoire de L. Febvre: une relecture', in *Rivista di storia della storiografia moderna*, 16 (1995), 75-96.

¹⁰ For "the anxiety of influence" cf. Natalie Zemon Davis, 'History's two bodies' in *American historical review*, 93 (1988), p. 29; for the enchanted circle, cf. M. Bloch in *AHES*, 5 (1934), p. 189; "To learn to step outside the enchanted circle is possibly the best way to remain faithful to the very spirit of the master who traced it".

Finally, the only woman on the collaborative scene was his wife, Simonne Vidal, who had free access to the impenetrable workplace of her husband, and who helped and worked with him on his research, reading and copy-typing his texts, and attending to them on an editorial level.

3. Time

During the period in which Marc Bloch lived and worked, two important transformations in the discipline of history came about, the first of which was the affirmation of the professional status of the historian, which subsequently led to the dissemination of the teaching of history in all categories of schooling¹¹. In short, the professional historian was, above all, given the task of training teachers: the nation, both secular and republican, was in need of teachers who would be faithful to national values.

As a grammar school professor from 1912 onward, Bloch was to interrupt the preparation of his doctoral thesis at the onset of the First World War, in which he participated first as a sergeant and then as an officer. Strasbourg having been recaptured by France, in 1919 he was appointed to the University of Strasbourg, and remained there until 1936, despite several unsuccessful attempts to return to Paris (his candidature for the creation of a chair of comparative history in European society at the Collège de France was in fact twice rejected). In 1936, he was appointed professor of economic history at the Sorbonne where, two years later, together with Maurice Halbwachs, he founded an Institute of Social and Economic History. As O. Dumoulin¹² rightly wrote, Bloch's innovative project became accepted by the university "marketplace", but not his revolutionary project for a comparative European history removed from the national framework.

The difficulties encountered by Bloch can also be explained by the transformation of the academic climate in France under the pressure of the national and international political events, and above all by the resurgence of anti-Semitism. Between August 1936 and August 1939 he stayed only a short time, less than three years, with various interruptions, in the French capital. He did not have the time to exert any substantial influence at the real centre of French cultural life. After the defeat in 1940, he was to change posts frequently. For some time, it seemed that he would have to move to the USA. Meanwhile, in the course of the 1930s, the thrust of contemporary events had heightened the tension -a hidden *Leitmotiv* of Bloch's work in the early post war years- between critical and historical thinking and public action. This constituted the main motivation in the historian's final years, as it did with so many of his other European colleagues.

¹¹ Cf. Arnaldo Momigliano, 'L'introduzione dell'insegnamento della storia come soggetto accademico e le sue implicazioni', in *Tra storia e storicismo* (Pisa: Nistri-Lischi, 1985), pp. 75-96.

¹² Olivier Dumoulin, 'Changer l'histoire, Marché universitaire et innovation intellectuelle à l'époque de Marc Bloch', in *Marc Bloch aujourd'hui. Histoire comparée et sciences sociales*, ed. by H. Atsma, A. Burguière (Paris : EHESS, 1990), pp. 87-104.

Historical observation

1. *Early Research*

At the end of his university studies, Bloch went to Germany on two occasions, in 1908 and again in 1909, to pursue some courses. He had already read the works of the German masters with whom he was to associate, Schmoller, Bücher and Lamprecht¹³. His journeys to Germany confirmed to Bloch that, in the field of social and economic history, which was the field that he had decided to research, the authorities were German. The amount of historical literature already produced was vast and of great importance¹⁴, and a French translation was either rare or non-existent in the initial stages.

On his return to France, Bloch obtained one of the most sought-after places as a scholarship student at the Foundation Thiers, guaranteeing him the very best conditions for the continuation of his studies towards his doctoral thesis. For his degree, Bloch had studied archive documents relating to the assets, in the thirteenth century, of the Chapter of Notre Dame in two archdioceses to the south of Paris. His attention was focused on the legal status of people and land, migratory phenomena, and the role of the capital in a rural environment¹⁵. In line with these research interests, Bloch wrote in a draft dated 27 March 1909, that he wanted to complete "a study into the disappearance of servitude in the Parisian region and on the related economic and legal implications of this disappearance".

In the first year, Bloch studied the legal situation of servants and prepared a map of the distribution of the various figures in the Ile-de-France¹⁶. During the following years, his research widened to cover other topics. The hundreds of index cards strewn amongst the twenty or so folders in his archives show that the historian dealt with the end of slavery in the ancient world, feudal justice and the origins of feudalism and the nobility. He dealt with economic development; the town; mediaeval art and literature and their social and political aspects; the history of rural France; the development of land ownership; and the vast ecclesiastical properties. He finally confronted the political powers with regard to the servants of the last Capetian kings of France¹⁷.

Bloch's teaching in grammar schools from the autumn of 1912 in Montpellier and in Amiens during the following year interrupted, or at least appreciably curtailed, these broad and prolific historical observations. The study of the disappearance of servitude had, in these three years, become considerably more extensive. In October 1912, the director of the Foundation Thiers spoke in a conclusive report of completed research into "a social system in the Ile-de-France characterised by a climate of servitude".

The analysis of published sources and documents stored in the Archives of France, at the Library Sainte Geneviève, at the Mazarine Library and in the depart-

¹³ Cf. Schöttler, 'Marc Bloch et Lucien Febvre', p. 77.

¹⁴ Cf. Schöttler, 'Marc Bloch und Deutschland', pp. 39-40. On the importance of German historical literature, Bloch's judgement can be found in CMB, 4 (1996), pp. 39, 80.

¹⁵ Cf. Friedman, 30.

¹⁶ Cf. Fink, 43.

¹⁷ Fink, pp. 43 and n. 44. This last aspect was to be the argument of his doctorate "cut short" in 1919, because of a decision to favour the combatants in the First World War.

mental archives of Seine-et-Oise, Eure-et-Loire, Loire and Seine-et-Marne had been very fruitful. Having collected the documentation, it remained only to edit the thesis; however the outbreak of the First World War forced Bloch to stop at this point.

In the early post-war years, Bloch had hoped to finish this work, leaving aside the "things of no importance" (*brouilles*): in March 1921, he wrote to his friend Davy, referring to articles on the false news reports, Saint Martin de Tours and finally the projected book on the thaumaturgic kings, "It is going to take some courage to start again with my rural population of the Ile-de-France". Bloch intended to use this for a book subtitled "study on feudal society". In 1921, he turned to the Société de l'Histoire in Paris seeking financial support. However, this help was not forthcoming and the "little project", the *brouille* on the thaumaturgic kings, took priority. In May 1924, Bloch again wrote to Berr that it was now or never, and that he absolutely had to use "all of his collected index cards on the rural population of the Ile-de France at the time of the disappearance of servitude"¹⁸.

The work on the documentation for his doctoral thesis was not Bloch's only pre-war activity, even though it formed a large part of it. His knowledge of the sources in the Ile-de-France and the Parisian region permitted Bloch to write a monographic study of the subject for a collection of works on the regions of France, directed by Berr¹⁹.

2. The Experience of War

Marc Bloch's participation in the First World War, mainly at the front save for brief interruptions, constituted an extreme case of historical observation. It was no longer a question of books, but of men in action and landscapes collected in the crude light of an experience of humankind stretched to its limits. There is no doubt that the war deeply affected his way of seeing things. The historian went to war as a good patriot, and returned a changed man and a changed scholar.

On a "technical" level, the war had been instructive regarding the tools and methods of research. One can imagine that the long marches and breaks in the countryside allowed Bloch to carry out a close and prolonged observation of the rural life and the forests, and in a way that would otherwise be impossible for a town dweller. As an "officer in the information service, assigned to topography, observation and information on the enemy", with a daily struggle to find observation points to track the movements of the *Boches*, he made use of specific techniques such as aerial photography, topographical survey and cartography²⁰.

But the real importance of his wartime experience cannot be attributed to this "technical" level. As an unexpected historical event and a drama of unheard-of proportion, the war greatly impressed Bloch, as it did other Europeans of the cultured classes, convinced that they lived in a civilised, refined world in which nations could collaborate. This world was to fall apart in July 1914. For many of those young bourgeois, used to travel and contacts, daily life suddenly became restrictive, monotonous and senseless; and then unexpectedly the rhythm accelerated. It was to be a

¹⁸ For the project of 1921 cf. M. Bloch *Rois et serfs, un chapitre d'histoire capétienne et autres écrits sur le servage*, (Paris : La boutique de l'histoire, 1996), pp. 305 foll. For the letters to Berr, cf. *Écrire "La société féodale": lettres à Henri Berr, 1924-1943*, ed. by J. Pluet-Despatin, (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1992), p. 27.

¹⁹ M. Bloch, *L'Ile-de-France (les pays autour de Paris)* (Paris: L. Cerf, 1913).

²⁰ Cf. Ulrich Raulff, *Ein Historiker im 20. Jahrhundert: Marc Bloch*, (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1995), pp. 152-153.

baptism of fire, followed by the dismal and perturbing spectacle of carnage. From that moment on, and for many years, they were to live in the trenches under bombardment, face to face with the enemy and awaiting the order to attack. They experienced both courage and terror in the face of mortal danger, wounds, mutilation and disintegrating bodies¹⁸. Bloch found himself plunged into a social situation that cannot be compared to any other contemporary experience, but nevertheless came closer to the life of bygone days such as the Middle Ages. Communications underwent interruption, distortion and material restriction. Legends and false information were rife; a passive acceptance of the propaganda spread and all critical spirit disappeared. Bloch, as a reader of H.G. Wells, must have thought of the effects of a time machine. The trench society, the world created at the battlefield, became for him the centre of an unrepeatable moral and intellectual experience, the will of destiny.

The war finally brought about in Bloch a real political maturity. Not only had he been given an opportunity to live in contact with people from the lower and working classes, but he experienced, amongst other things, the boundaries created by class consciousness and the relative psychological phenomena. He realised that, whilst belonging to the bourgeoisie, he was not a conservative.

Historical experiment. Criticism and analysis

1. *Original Characters*

Bloch's experience as a historian took place between 1919 and 1936, mainly in Strasbourg, which had been won back by France. The fact that the inauguration ceremony at the university on 22 November 1919 opened and closed with the playing of the Marseillaise and in the presence of the President of the Republic, Poincaré, left no doubt as to the significance of the "reconquest" that had taken place.

Thus, immediately after the war, Bloch found himself taking part in a national strategy for the promotion of French science, in which the progress of studies and a political and patriotic commitment were *de facto*. This led to a close collation of the texts on German history. It was not about scientific nationalism²¹, but rather an anti-Romantic and liberal idea of what the French nation was: a "creation" of the course of European history, not a sacred union of race, language and territory with the mission of dominance over other nations. With this premise, and in the singular environment of Strasbourg, the French nation became the ideal motive and sense of commitment for Bloch to understand the history, even if it remained an absorbing and very difficult historical problem²².

¹⁸ Cf. S. Audoin-Rouzeau, 'Introduction', in M. Bloch, *Écrits de guerre, 1914-1918* (Paris: A. Colin, 1997), p. 32 (which also points out the present interest of historians in this aspect of the experience of war); F. Stern, 'Historians and the Great War. Private experience and public explanation', *Yale Review*, 82 (1994), 34-53.

²¹ "I cannot stand scientific nationalism", Bloch wrote to G. Espinas on 21 July 1934, in Schöttler, 'Marc Bloch und Deutschland', p. 33.

²² Of such difficulty that, in the *Universal History* by Berr, the planned volume on the European nations was, after careful examination, suppressed: cf. L. Febvre, *Lettres à Henri Berr*, ed. by G. Candar and J. Pluët-Despatin, (Paris: Fayard, 1997), pp. 281-282.

Bloch's situation as a "national" historian, in the terms that we have defined, had two important consequences on the original characteristics of historiography (and in this alone he can be considered extremely innovative for his time). The first was the choice of a perspective of comparison that appeared in the study of social and economic phenomena (the "profound" facts of history, those of the most certain nature and which contradictory evidence cannot alter). The second was the choice of Europe as a "large homeland"; as the geographic field for his research. This same French national history was incomprehensible removed from a European context. Comparative socio-economic history, a European arena and a love of the elementary and "structural" game of social relationships were to be the original characteristics of Bloch's historiography.

In the following paragraphs, we shall present Bloch's texts, grouping them under several broad headings. These are, in part, removed from the categories in which the historian placed them in his dossier under mentality, literature, intellectual life, sacred sovereignty, personal liberty and servility, rural history, feudal and upper class social structure, and economy and technology.

2. *Mentality, Literature, Intellectual Life*

In the draft of a collection of his essays to be entitled *Historians in the Workshop* (*Historiens à l'atelier*), dating from the first years of the 1930s, Bloch had envisaged an initial section devoted to *Images and Collective Imaginations*. The theme of collective mentality, which, for the historian constituted an original revision of the Durkheimian theories, appears – excepted the book on the 'royal touch', which we shall discuss in the following paragraph – in a series of essays which were at times linked to reflections over literature and intellectual life. In the discussion on Maurice Halbwachs' volume on *Cadres sociaux de la mémoire*²³, Bloch acknowledged the important role played by collective memory in the development of history. This secured the position of the social group in relation to the past and the present and "does not preserve the past but rather, to be precise, constantly rediscovers or reconstitutes it, starting from the present. Each memory is a commitment, an attempt, an effort (*toute mémoire est un effort*)".

In consequence, the critical study of the errors and distortions that came about with the transmission of recollections was extremely important. The historian had to understand how evidence and traditions took shape. Scepticism should not necessarily detract from the value of certainty in history; the romantic background, full of curious and colourful details, would fall apart, but criticism "concerns only things of a fairly superficial nature. Legal, economic or religious history is not in question; equally, the most profound historical facts are in all probability those where there is a greater degree of certainty"²⁴.

The essay on the false news of the First World War was a perfect example of the conditions involved in the formation of "untrue accounts, false news, stories, imposture and myths". The latter always arose from an already existent collective portrayal

²³ M. Bloch, *Mémoire collective, tradition et coutume. A propos d'un livre récent*, in RSH, 40 (1925), pp. 73-83.

²⁴ M. Bloch, *Réflexions d'un historien sur les fausses nouvelles de la guerre*, in MH, (1921), p. 43.

of events and under particular social circumstances in life²⁵. The two essays on the afterlife of King Solomon and the origins of the epic Arthurian cycle²⁶ were dedicated to the study of well-founded traditions of reminiscences, stories and images.

3. Sacred Sovereignty

In 1919, in a conversation with Ch. E. Perrin, Bloch revealed for the first time the idea of studying the sacred and supernatural character of the kings of France. Five years later, in Strasbourg, he published a book entitled *Les rois thaumaturges. Étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre* (*The Royal touch. Monarchy and miracles in France and England*). Such was the originality of this "direction" of research that many of the readers and reviewers of the work took some time to understand quite what it was about²⁷. The study was devoted to a particular aspect of sacred sovereignty, namely the ability attributed to the kings of France (and England) to miraculously cure those suffering from scrofula, or tuberculosis of the lymph glands. The investigation and account developed on two levels: firstly, the analytical reconstruction (and final demystification) of the belief in the thaumaturgic power of the kings and, secondly, research into the general representations capable of explaining that belief. As Le Goff wrote, the book is both "the history of a miracle and of beliefs in a miracle"²⁸. Like an "extremely sensitive seismograph, capable of registering the vicissitudes of the power of the monarchy or the ideology associated with this power", the belief in thaumaturgy "amplified the resonance" of monarchical power in European history during the long period from the Middle Ages until the Restoration²⁹.

In that "gros enfant", as the author nicknamed his first book of importance, various elements came together: the interest, revived by his recent war-time experience, in the myths, collective errors, beliefs, false news and miracles, against which, one can read in an unpublished note, "experience is of no value". The appeal of collective representation had already been kindled in Bloch by Durkheimians such as Granet and Davy in the days of the Foundation Thiers. Although Bloch's approach was resolutely diachronic, he studied a collective representation that had lasted for eight centuries (and this was particularly criticised by Halbwachs, a col-

²⁵ *Réflexions d'un historien sur les fausses nouvelles de la guerre*, p. 44: "Only great collective states of mind have the power to transform a defective perception into a legend". Audouin-Rouzeau, 'Introduction', p. 23n, points to the subsequent bibliography on the false news regarding the war, (in particular the recent works of J. Horne and A. Kramer).

²⁶ M. Bloch, *La vie d'outre-tombe du roi Salomon*, in MH, (1925), pp. 920-938; M. Bloch, *Tradition ou littérature: les origines du cycle arthurien*, in RSH, 51 (1931), pp. 95-111.

²⁷ The first edition is at the Faculty of Arts of Strasbourg, Strasbourg 1924. A.R. Fawtier made the observation in a review that the book fell "outside the realm of history", to which Bloch replied that he envied the certainty with which the reviewer "knew where history stopped" (*Moyen-Age*, (1927), p. 34). Again, in 1946, Franco Venturi defined Bloch's book as "extremely curious": cf. Gabriele Turi, *Casa Einaudi, Libri uomini idee oltre il fascismo*, (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1990), p. 221. The "rediscovery" of the *Royal touch* took place more than fifty years after its first appearance in the Italian edition of 1973 and the French edition of 1983 (ed. respectively by Carlo Ginzburg for Einaudi and Jacques Le Goff for Gallimard).

²⁸ J. Le Goff, "Prefazione", in M. Bloch, *I re taumaturghi*, (Torino: Einaudi, 1989), p. 22. Le Goff's essay contains an accurate internal reconstruction of the work, an informed presentation of the genesis, the results, the success of the theme and a look at the possible present significance of the book (with reference also to the unpublished remarks by Bloch).

²⁹ Cf. C. Ginzburg, "Prefazione", in M. Bloch, *I re taumaturghi*, (Torino: Einaudi, 1973), p. 14.

league at Strasbourg and official representative of the Durkheimian school)³⁰. Bloch's stimuli were numerous: Frazer's comparative anthropology, and Lévy-Bruhl's study of primitive mentality. His interest in healing as a medical event in the strict sense of the word had been nourished by conversations with his brother Louis, a doctor himself, and whom Bloch held in high esteem. In short, he had the will to demonstrate, by way of an apparently irrelevant subject, his own ability in the field of research and historical interpretation, and the extraordinary power of erudite and intellectual study. The involvement of numerous specialists, archivists and librarians had the dual result of bringing about an unusual historical experience and the writing of a book, which even today appears illuminating and wonderfully documented.

Bloch adopted a unique method of dealing with problems and developments that were close to his heart but which, until that time, he had only touched upon, and which subsequently, after the book, remained low on the list of his research priorities. Contrary to the idea expressed by G. von Below regarding the survival of any really true national institutions in the Middle Ages, Bloch maintained that there were indeed numerous microscopic "societies" in that period³¹. The family, the group formed by the Landlord and his *homines*, the manoir or manor, the corporation, the commune and the mediaeval "states" were an "incoherent and unstable" agglomeration of this micro-societies. The historic role of the king in this context became fundamental. "The nation depends on the king for its existence", and political power coincided with the power of the monarchy, particularly the French monarchy, as had been keenly observed³². The age-old tradition of the sacred monarchy, whose origins, according to Bloch, were principally Germanic and had over the years become obsolete and disappeared, was balanced in this historical view by the "contractual" nature of the monarchy in which the king was king for as long as he loyally protected his subjects³³. These were problems that, if tackled directly, would have displayed an unequalled political dimension (resulting in distortion of historical facts). It was a case of thinking about the history of power in France and re-examining the development of the French nation at a time when the experience of war had modified the position of the various "spiritual families" in the French political culture. Adopting a "scientific" strategy, but with a definite political commitment, Bloch chose to confront the problems indirectly, from the particularly unusual point of view of the "miraculous event"³⁴.

³⁰ M. Halbwachs, review of M. Bloch, *Les rois thaumaturges*, in *Année sociologique*, (1923-1924), pp. 536-542. On this aspect of the relationship between the Durkheimians, cf. Friedman, 116-117; Müller, 'Marc Bloch und die Sozialwissenschaften', p. 80, 83.

³¹ *Revue historique*, 128 (1918), pp. 343-347.

³² Cf. G. Arnaldi, 'Potere e monarchia in Marc Bloch', *La Cultura*, 25 (1987), 371-377; K. Pomian, 'L'heure des "Annales"', in *Les lieux de mémoire*, II: *La nation*, (Paris: Gallimard, 1986), pp. 399 foll.

³³ *Revue historique*, 138 (1921), pp. 248-251 [Germanic origins of sacred sovereignty]; as a consequence, Bloch rejects the primitive republicanism of the Germans: *I re thaumaturghi* (1973), p. 387; Pomian, 'L'heure des "Annales"', p. 409 (the slow disappearance of sacred sovereignty); MH, p. 188 (the loyal protector king; on this point cf. also P. Bonassie, 'Marc Bloch, historien de la servitude', in *Marc Bloch aujourd'hui*, ed. by Hartmut Atsma and André Burguière (Paris: Editions de l'EHESS, 1990, p. 375n).

³⁴ "What I wanted to give here", he wrote in the introduction, "is essentially a contribution to the political history of Europe in a broad sense, in the exact sense of the term". U. Raulff rightly insists upon the indirectly political character of the *Royal touch*, in Raulff, 268 foll.

4. Liberty and Servitude

As has been seen, the problem of servants (*serfs*) was at the centre of considerable research work carried out by Bloch in the years prior to the First World War. The events of the war prevented the work from becoming a book. The dissertation for Bloch's doctorate, already discussed, *Rois et serfs, un chapitre d'histoire capétienne*, and published in 1920, had been intended as a complementary thesis, a critical exercise on two documents relating to the principle thesis: the *ordonnances* or "letters of commission" regarding the liberation of the servants of the kings Louis X and Philippe V³⁵. Bloch's study had been structured to start from this point, but it then expanded to the extent of including all the acts of liberation of all those in the service of the French kings from the beginning of the twelfth century until 1328: "a chapter of the financial history of the Capetian kings".

The desire, expressed in the preface, to make use of the documentation gathered on the whole phenomenon of servitude (*servage*) came about not as a book but as a series of significant articles³⁶. It aimed, above all, at demonstrating the path from the slavery of the ancient world to the servitude of the Middle Ages. Between the sixth and the thirteenth century, therefore, four different "figures" came into play: the slave of bygone days "a tool equipped with a voice" (*instrumentum vocale*); the liberated slave, who was not, however, free; the serf; and the slave of foreign origin, of whom there were only a modest number between the ninth and twelfth centuries, up until the full resumption of international trade.

The social structure in the early Middle Ages was based on the relationships of personal dependence; consequently, it was the "particular nature of the ties of subjection" that determined a man's place in society. At this time, two categories clearly emerged: on the one hand, those who were voluntarily bound, such as the vassal, who was not obliged to serve consecutive generations and, on the other, those whose indissoluble status had been established prior to birth and was transferred to their descendants. Only close relatives were included in the category of the "liberated". Those who were relegated to the second category, that is, not free, were not, however, slaves in the ancient sense of the word (personal belongings): they had to secure an income and *corvées*, or jobs.

The studies on liberty and servitude, frequently centred on the interpretation of words (*servus glebae, collibertus*), were always based on the balance between the study of changing social phenomena and that of the legal structures, undergoing

³⁵ M. Bloch, *Rois et serfs, un chapitre d'histoire capétienne et autres écrits sur le servage* (Paris: La boutique de l'histoire, 1996), pp. 5-6.

³⁶ M. Bloch, *Blanche de Castille et les serfs du chapitre de Paris*, in MH, (1911), pp. 462-490; M. Bloch, *Comment et pourquoi finit l'esclavage antique*, in MH, (1947 but 1932), pp. 261-285; M. Bloch, *Serf de la glèbe, histoire d'une expression toute faite*, in MH, (1921), pp. 356-372; M. Bloch, "Collibertus" or "Colibertus", in MH, (1926), pp. 373-376; M. Bloch, *Servus glebae*, in MH, pp. 373-376; M. Bloch, *Les "colliberti": étude sur la formation de la classe servile*, in MH, (1928), pp. 385-451; M. Bloch, *Un problème d'histoire comparée: la min-sterialité en France et en Allemagne*, in MH, (1928), pp. 503-528; M. Bloch, *Liberté et servitude personnelles au Moyen-Age, particulièrement en France*, in MH, (1933), pp. 286-355; M. Bloch, *De la cour royale à la cour de Rome: le procès des serfs de Rosny-sous-Bois*, in MH, (1938), pp. 452-461; M. Bloch, *The rise of dependent cultivation and seignorial institutions*, in MH, (1941, but 1937), pp. 210-260 (French text in CMB, 3 (1995), pp. 54-106). Cf. Bonnassié, 'Marc Bloch, historien de la servitude. Réflexions sur le concept de "classe servile"', pp. 363-387 and D. Barthélemy, 'Postface', in *Rois et serfs*, pp. 311-332 (which also discuss the sharp criticisms by L. Verriest of Bloch's approach to the problem of servitude).

perpetual revision and change. They therefore covered a vast chronological span of observation, dating from the Late antiquity to the fourteenth century. Less extensive, but aimed at comparative history, was the "geographical" frame of his work, the Parisian region or France in general.

5. *Rural History*

The nature of Bloch's interest in rural history is "total", so profound and extensive was this interest. His reflections, his own works and his attention to the relative bibliography related to a prolonged period of time, running from prehistoric times to the agricultural revolution of the eighteenth century and beyond. In 1926, he wrote that the phenomena of the population and the exploitation of the land constituted the "deep-down reality of the life of the nation"³⁷.

As Toubert demonstrated, Bloch's attraction to the rural life became clear very early on, and it deepened as a result of the teachings of the German masters between 1908 and 1909, and to his reading of the works of English historians during the following years. From the German *Siedlungsforschung* and the English *Settlement history*, Bloch learned methods of studying agricultural techniques, the collective psychology of the rural world, the processes involved in working the soil, the morphology of the agglomerations and the typology of the countryside.

From the mid-1920s onward, one of the major "sections" opened in Bloch's workshop was, indeed, the research into the agricultural landscape, the occupation and exploitation of the land, the different types of settlements, the constraints of collective bondage, rural habitations, the outline of fields, agricultural techniques and, finally, the legal conditions of ownership and exploitation of the land. Bloch's field of study was Europe and the West, but with a particular interest in the borderlands, for example, the German colonisation towards the east, and the "expansion" of these areas. A list of "books to write", dated December 1940, showed Bloch's intention to study the population of the USA³⁸.

An important aspect of the historian's research was his concentration on the "agrarian regimes" and "agrarian civilisation". Characterised by the presence of certain agricultural techniques and legal restrictions that "are imposed" on a social group³⁹, the agrarian regimes suffered the effects of the imposition of agricultural "conditions of production".

³⁷ Cf. in general P. Toubert, 'Genesi e fortuna di un libro di Marc Bloch: "Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française"', *La Cultura*, 31 (1993), 63-97; Toubert, 'Marc Bloch e il dopo: la storia agraria e le "Annales" (1929-1985)', *Quaderni storici*, 25 (1990), 74, 487-500; Friedman, 134-151; G. Luzzatto, 'Marc Bloch e la storia dell'agricoltura', in M. Bloch, *I caratteri originali della storia rurale francese* (Torino: Einaudi, 1982), pp. 9-20; P. Cammarosano, 'Ambiente e popolazioni', *Quaderni storici*, 25 (1990), 74, 511-522. Cf. Also the section 'L'histoire rurale revisitée', in Atsma and Bruguière, pp. 159-252 (with texts by L. Génicot, G. Bois, R. Hilton, H. Kellenbenz, R. Fossier, E. Le Roy Ladurie).

³⁸ Toubert, 'Marc Bloch e il dopo', p. 489; for the extent of Bloch's work on these themes see also the outline of «cours de Fontenay», in Marc Bloch, *La terre et le paysan*, ed. by E. Bloch (Paris: A. Colin, 1999), pp. 176-244. Cf. also the letters to R. Boutrouche, in CMB, 4 (1996), p. 43 (legal conditions). For the population of the USA, see M. Bloch, *Mea* (unpublished notebook), f. 17r.

³⁹ M. Bloch, 'Le problème de régimes agraires' (1932), in Bloch, *La terre et le paysan*, pp. 109-133 (= MH, pp. 648-669).

Another significant problem studied by the historian was the attempt in the late 1700s to impose the closure of the fields (*édits sur les clôtures*) on the rural communities; that “struggle for agrarian individualism”. This was to be the subject of a lengthy essay based on the abundance of material resulting from the French public surveys from the years 1766, 1768 and 1787. This was only one element of a much broader agricultural transformation in Europe. Together with the development of farming techniques and the disappearance of the manor (*seigneurie rurale*), this was to become known as the “agricultural revolution”, which came to an end in the mid-nineteenth century, and on which Bloch intended to write a book for Berr’s collection⁴⁰.

The research work on the agricultural history of France was, on the part of the historian, connected to the refining of the comparative method, meaning a research into differences. This was a clear-cut distinction between the comparativist approach of Durkheim, which constituted research into similarities⁴¹. The very extensive and systematic document, in which the historian put forward his views on the subject, was the report to the sixth International Congress of Historical Science in Oslo in 1928⁴².

The *Caractères originaux de l’histoire rurale française*⁴³, arose from the attempt to point out the widespread and generalised problems regarding agrarian regimes and rural landscapes. The *Caractères* is a tentative book, open and for the main part hypothetical, rich in suggestions, exceptions, and research projects⁴⁴. In general, returning to the results of his studies on agrarian administration, and taking advantage of the comparative method, Bloch tried to define the rural areas of France as a combination of technical regulations, crop rotation and principles of social organisation. The technical factors and social phenomena came together in a single framework of historical reconstruction, as, for example, in the case concerning the type of plough, which would have seemed to be a purely technical matter.

In addition to his interest in agricultural techniques, Bloch turned his attention to the legal conditions concerning land ownership and the partition of land. The “premature synthesis” in the lectures of 1929 and the studies on rural history were of an intrinsically provisional value. However, Bloch’s workshop remained open;

⁴⁰ M. Bloch, ‘La lutte pour l’individualisme agraire dans la France du XVIII^e siècle’ (1930), in Bloch, *La terre et le paysan*, pp. 257-349 (= AHES, 2 (1930), pp. 329-384, 511-556).

⁴¹ Cf. Emile Durkheim, *Les règles de la méthode sociologique* (Paris: Alcan, 1901), pp. 153-171, 185. See also Bloch’s intervention in the *Bulletin du Centre international de synthèse* (9 June 1930), pp. 31 foll., and discussion on pp. 15-19 (“the first idea evoked by the ‘comparative method’ expression is that of a difference; a difference between two social systems”).

⁴² M. Bloch, ‘Per una storia comparata delle società europee’, in M. Bloch, *Lavoro e tecnica nel Medioevo*, (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1977), pp. 3-47 (=RSH, 46 (1928), pp. 15-50); naturally, on the subject of historical comparison, Bloch also refers to the example of Pirenne. For Meillet cf. *La méthode comparative en linguistique historique* (Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co., 1925), pp. 1-11. Observations on the present limits of the position of Bloch, in M. Detienne, *Comparer l’incomparable* (Paris: Seuil, 2000), pp. 29-30.

⁴³ (Oslo-Paris: Instituttet for sammnliggende Kulturforskning-Belles Lettres, 1931).

⁴⁴ Amongst the proposed themes we find the areas involved in the spread of the two types of plough, those with or without wheels; the agrarian history of the Norman settlement; the European delimitation of the phenomenon of long and open fields; the detailed classification of rural French civilisations according to altitude, geographic factors, and the confusion between the two; the clearing of the land (*défrichements*); the causes of the transformation of the rural landlord with a private income (*rentier*) and the contrast on this point between France, England and Germany.

in the meantime came the publication of works on the history of the French countryside⁴⁵ by other authors. "I shall continue to save lectures and material for a reconstruction (*refonte totale*) of the *Caractères*", Bloch wrote to Febvre on 22 June 1942. Again, in February 1944, a few days before his arrest, he confirmed that he was thinking about the rewriting of the book⁴⁶ to Robert-Henri Bautier, whom he had met in the archives of Creuse.

In addition to his personal studies, Bloch intended to promote research into rural studies by means of a series of books, planned during 1934-1935, and to be published by Gallimard under the title of "Le paysan et la terre". It was to be a series of autonomous works, at times in the form of a handbook, which would illustrate the "variety of rural life" by means of "intertwined rays of light" (*feux entrecroisés*)⁴⁷.

6. Social Structures. Feudalism and manor (seigneurie rurale)

There is a marked difference in quality between the studies of the late 1930s, the masterpiece on feudal society and the essays on manor and dependent cultivation, and those completed by Bloch by the beginning of the 1930s⁴⁸. At that moment, there had been the extensive examination of the rural population of the Ile-de-France which, as we have seen, was interrupted by the First World War. This had been followed by two ambitious projects. The first was to try to resolve a difficult problem of collective psychology (the belief in the *royal miracle*) and the second an attempt to prepare a tentative book on the rural history of France. However, until the beginning of the 1930s, the historian had no opportunity to set about the realisation of his ideal of an analytical and explanatory history, already drafted in the notebook of 1906. He had examined documents and analysed historical phenomena; he had interpreted and resolved difficult problems; and he had criticised and exploited masses of learned texts, but he still had not completed a genuine "historical experiment". This was to come about at the beginning of 1933, with the study of two social structures: feudal society and the *manoir* or manor.

In fact, Bloch's book on feudal society represented the point of convergence between the observations stored in his archives, and the more complex points made in a collection of research on social structures. These were included in further works dedicated to other aspects of his studies, such as dependent cultivation, manoir or

⁴⁵ Friedman, 144-148 (which refers to the works of G. Roupnel and R. Dion).

⁴⁶ After the death of the author, 36 files of documents and remarks on this subject were found, some of which were particularly bulky, such as those on the plough and on the forests. The abundance of this last file, which subsequently disappeared, would lead us to think that Bloch had planned to write a history of the forests of France. Robert Dauvergne put together a "supplement" to the *Caractères* using Bloch's numerous writings on rural history which came out after 1931. Cf. R. Dauvergne, 'Introduction', in Marc Bloch, *Les caractères de l'histoire rurale française*, t. II: *Supplément établi d'après les travaux de l'auteur* (Paris: A. Colin, 1968), VI, (for the meeting with Bautier) and XV (situation of the file). This publication is now out of date because of the previously mentioned complete collection of Bloch's writings on rural history, *La terre et le paysan*, ed. by E. Bloch.

⁴⁷ On the draft of the series, the intended collaborators, the only volume to appear [that by H. Labouret on the *Paysans d'Afrique occidentale* (Paris: Gallimard, 1941)] cf. Friedman, pp. 160 foll., 235.

⁴⁸ M. Bloch, *La société féodale*, t. 1, *La formation des liens de dépendance* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1939); t. 2, *Les classes et le gouvernement des hommes* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1940); M. Bloch *The rise of dependent cultivation* cit.; M. Bloch *Seigneurie française et manoir anglais* (1934) (Paris: A. Colin, 1960).

social classes. The architecture of the book, which immediately attracted radical criticism for being unbalanced⁴⁹, was the original result of an innovative project implicit in Bloch's hypothesis. It dealt with the Muslim, Hungarian and Norman invasions, different ways of feeling and thinking and family ties. It also dealt with servitude and fief, dependent relationships in the lower strata of society, justice and the initial formation of nation states. It can be said that every page attempted to reply, in as detailed a way as possible, to the various aspects of the unique problem of what exactly the feudal social structure meant.

The "formal" solution to the problem was set out by Bloch in a lengthy final chapter entitled "*Feudalism as a social model and its influence*"⁵⁰. The first definition proposed was negative: feudal society was not based solely on parental ties (*lignage*) and, as such, was not bound by a state-run public authority that would have been in a position to bring weight to bear on the local powers. However, this society came about following a society based on lineage and dominated by the power of the state, born "as a result of the brutal dissolution of more ancient societies" and, in particular, through the fusion of two unequally developed societies, provoked by the German invasion. This destroyed the "social framework" (*cadres sociaux*) of both populations and resulted in the emergence of ancient and even primitive phenomena. The reinforcement of the two societies was "disarticulated", and this permitted the development of customs of a particularly outmoded nature, such as personal dependence and manor, an "essential element in feudal social structure". The overall results of this process were a pronounced slowing down of the vitality of relationships and of monetary circulation (which prevented the rise of a salaried bureaucratic class), and the spread of a new type of mentality, sensitive and down-to-earth.

The feudal structure, characterised by the presence of Landlords, bellicose leaders, a network of subordinate relationships and the fief as a form of recompense for service, became the dominant pattern in northern and central European mediaeval civilisation, with several "large gaps": the Scandinavian peninsula, Friesland and Ireland. The destiny of the "systems of human institutions", according to the historian, was never to be completely realised.

From the middle of the eighteenth century onwards, European society began to move away from feudalism, but the social structures did not disappear overnight. The feudal lords survived, as did the "warlike" ideal that animated the nobility. The notion of a bilateral contract between the lord and the vassal also persisted; a "convention" directed towards the restriction of power, and the lord who failed to respect his undertakings lost his rights⁵¹.

At this point, it should be noted that Bloch's texts on the "social structures" which had, up until this time, been described as conjectural or "unsuccessful", even

⁴⁹ Cf. F. Lot, 'La société féodale', *Journal des Savants* (1943), 13-32, 49-58; on the matter of the two reviews written by L. Febvre [appearing in AHS, 2 (1940), 1, pp. 39-43; AHS, 3 (1941), 3-4, pp. 125-130] cf. M. Mastrogregori, *Il manoscritto interrotto di Marc Bloch* (Pisa-Roma: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1995), pp. 45-48. Balanced observations on the structure of Bloch's book in G. Arnaldi, 'Pouvoir et monarchie. Présentation', in Atsma and Burguière, pp. 111-113.

⁵⁰ Bloch, *La société féodale*, pp. 603-612.

⁵¹ *La société féodale*, pp. 613-620. On the duration and strength of the social structure cf. also M. Bloch, 'Que demander à l'histoire?' in MH, (1937), p. 13.

though incomplete, did in fact comprise a very complex model of historical explanation (or historical experiment, according to Bloch's vocabulary). Only in the book on feudal society and in the essays on manorial system did Bloch in fact, adopt a "completely new" method: the "dismantling of a social structure" (*démontage d'une structure sociale*). It was in these texts that he carried out a veritable historical experiment that had been carefully constructed and constantly controlled, and in which it was possible to keep track of the essential aspects of his method⁵².

The first step was a sort of "rebuttal of the traditional words". The word "feudal" was a bad choice; a type of complex social organisation could not be qualified by the attribution of a single description of real property (the fief) when so many other economic and social organisations were present in the Middle Ages. This was not the only ill chosen word. In February 1933, at a fairly delicate moment when he was trying to persuade Berr to accept his vision of the book assigned to him, Bloch realised that he was not succeeding in making himself understood. He was forced to put the words in inverted commas and explain not only what he meant by "institution", but also in which sense the facts that are termed "political" played a secondary role in his project. This rebuttal of traditionally accepted terms continued in the successive discussions following the publication of the book, also involving the definition of the word "mentality". It should be added that the book on feudal society was lacking in proper nouns, characters and places, and was to comprise Bloch's first attempt to create a sort of artificial space for his historical experiment. This was to be a space in which he could move around with more freedom (above all with respect to the conditioning imposed by scholarly literature on this subject). Inside this space the historian skilfully brought several elements into play, never defined with precision, and therefore formulated in many ways: civilisation; events; conditions; factors; environments; features and distinctive characteristics; and, finally, social structures.

In his examples of civilisations, the element of greatest breadth to be included in the experiment, the historian referred to the ancient Mediterranean civilisation, as opposed to that of Europe (in other texts, however, he referred to those of Japan, Islam and South America). In the space for civilisation, but on a minor level, the events, historical factors and the historical environment were "conditions" of the social transformation. The invasions with which the *Société Féodale* opened were, for example, defined by Bloch in a letter to Berr as "*factors of profound social transformation*"⁵³. Even the phenomena described by Bloch in the following chapter (facts on economy and population, ways of feeling and thinking, collective memory, law and custom, forms of religion, exchange and transport) were "conditions" of social structures. Events, mentality and living conditions were the environment, the atmosphere in which the social structure moved; they were the historical shapes that rendered it real and anchored it to a time and a place.

⁵² On the difference between experimentation particular to the natural sciences and analyses of a "natural", or social event which are more appropriate to the historical experiment, cf. for example, the essay 'Que demander à l'histoire?', in *MH*, vol. 1, pp. 5-7 and 13 (in which the suggestion can be found that the historian must "discover, define and take apart" the social phenomenon, after having observed how the presence or absence of particular factors or traits can alter the results). Just such a difference figures as the first point of the draft of chapter five of *The Historian's Craft*; (cf. Marc Bloch, *Apologie*, p. 48).

⁵³ M. Bloch, *Écrire La société féodale: lettres à Henri Berr, 1924-1943* (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1992), p. 82.

Therefore, at the heart of the historical experiment lay the social structures, also called regimes, social systems or institutional framework. The two structures studied by Bloch were, as said, feudalism and manoir or manor (*seigneurie rurale*). The structures were "groups of fundamental features", and were both mobile, but with distinctive and variable characteristics. These traits or characteristics were the phenomena that the historian observed and analysed. In the case of feudalism, for example, it was a question of supremacy of a class of warriors, ties of obedience, and protection and division of power. In the case of rural upper classes, it was a question of subjection of farm workers, services rendered to the lords, power of command that was in competition with that of public authority, and absence of slavery.

But to dwell on the individualisation of these elements, the "depths" of civilisation, in which events acted as conditions and social structures moved with their distinctive traits, would be to miss the real characteristic of the historical experiment as conceived by Bloch, namely the change. Had he not written as early as 1931, in a particularly enigmatic way, that social structure could be defined only "through its own disposition to a perpetual metamorphosis, following directions of development that are perhaps its clearest distinctive characteristic"?⁵⁴

The constellation formed by these civilisations, events, conditions, traits and structures continually changed its form. Such movement was accentuated by the existence of further social structures (for example, feudalism and manor); the imperfect way in which the structure "covered" the same territory (the "gaps" left by the feudal system in the European area)⁵⁵; the diverse solutions to the problems posed by the same historical conditions; the survival of traits of old structures; the sudden change in conditions; the new factors of metamorphosis (such as events)⁵⁶ and the unequal evolution of single distinctive features of the structure.

Bloch's attempt at a "completely new" and "exportable", method, i.e. the analysis of a social structure, as he defined it in a letter to Berr, finally began to take shape. The "historical experiment" revealed itself in all its complexity. Its principle tool was comparison, which gave birth to a "microscopic" observation of scattered phenomena in large geographical areas, balancing two different types of "scale" of analysis and narrative.

Between structures that followed on from each other or coexisted, different civilisations, "distinctive traits" and changing phenomena, emerged a very broad and innovative vision of history. It was in this framework that Bloch's passion for the

⁵⁴ Cf. M. Bloch, 'Féodalité, vassalité, seigneurie', AHES, 3 (1931), p. 248.

⁵⁵ The Scandinavian Peninsula, Friesland and Ireland. They can be linked to the case of Sardinia, where there was a rural upper class, but not the feudal relationships involved, and that of Ditmarschen, from which the upper class regime was absent. "When the very notion of historical experiment is definitively accepted as one of our methods", wrote the historian, "then these exceptional societies will become interesting. Due to the particularity of their structures, these locations in fact constitute a marvellous reactive agent for discovering the actual influential factors to which they have not been subjected". [AHES, 10 (1938), p. 50].

⁵⁶ The events, occurrences, or "important factors" are represented in the draft of the fifth chapter of 'The Historian's Craft'. Bloch had been thinking of tackling this, he wrote to Febvre in March 1943, in a "very non-Durkheimian way", and probably, therefore, without deleting the *événements* from the field of scientific knowledge (cf. Marc Bloch, *Apologie*, pp. 48, 50).

theme of prevision (which he had planned to deal with in chapter seven of *The Historian's Craft*), was included.

In the somewhat demanding page of *Strange Defeat*, in which Bloch allowed for the possibility of history being able to predict future phenomena, he in fact again took a position on the coming about of the historical experiment. History could not experiment in order to modify "elements of reality. However, to discover the relationships that bound the spontaneous variations in factors to those of the phenomena, observation and analysis are sufficient tools. In this way, history arrives at the reasons for things and their mutation. In brief, history is an authentic experimental science because it succeeds increasingly well in uncovering the ins and outs of cause and effect by intelligently studying, "dismantling" and comparing reality"⁵⁷.

The terms used by the author in this text had a specific significance. "Observation" and "analysis" were two moments of historical knowledge (he was to devote a chapter to each of these in *The Historian's Craft*). "Intelligence" was the criticism of the interpretation of documents, and "comparison" was the broad view; the possibility to experimentally interpolate diverse series of data. These operations "built" the realities that were phenomena and social structures, revealing the logic of their change and metamorphosis. In particular, they indicated which relationships existed between the variations in factors (another "technical" term meaning the events or the mentalities) and those of phenomena themselves.

7. Economic history

A few days after finishing the first draft of the *Société Féodale* in June 1936, Bloch was called upon to take the only Chair of economic history in French academic system, that of the Faculty of Arts at the Sorbonne. Having failed in his attempt to inaugurate the teaching of "comparative history of European society" at the Collège de France, the mediaeval scholar thus officially became a specialist in economic history. At this time, and in this capacity, Bloch, in addition to his teaching, held special courses at the École Normale Supérieure. He edited the bibliography on French economic history for the prestigious "Economic History Review" and also, in 1938, founded an Institute of Socio-Economic History at the Sorbonne, together with Maurice Halbwachs. This was to be devoted to the "development", co-ordination and promotion of historical studies into economic factors in their own right, and in relation to the history of ideas and that of social structures⁵⁸.

Professional reasons, therefore, led Bloch to concentrate on his research into economic history which, until this point, he had practised mainly by writing observations, comments and critical reviews⁵⁹. Even after assuming his "official" role, the interventionist style dominant in Bloch's themes remained the point of critical discussion, rather than the exposure of new research.

⁵⁷ M. Bloch, *L'étrange défaite* (Paris: Gallimard, 1990), p. 151.

⁵⁸ Cf. Fink, 190n, 192.

⁵⁹ M. Bloch, 'Avènement et conquêtes du moulin à eau', AHES, 7 (1935), pp. 538-563; M. Bloch, 'Les inventions Médiévales', AHES, 7 (1935); cf. also M. Bloch, 'Technique et évolution sociale, à propos de l'histoire de l'attelage et de celle de l'esclavage', RSH, 41 (1926), pp. 91-99; M. Bloch, 'Technique et évolution sociale, réflexions d'un historien', *Europe*, 47 (1938), 185, pp. 23-32 (= MH, pp. 833-838). Among the reviews, see in particular those regarding the general economic history [AHES, 1 (1929), pp. 252-258; AHES, 2 (1930), pp. 132-135] and the work of François Simiand [RSH, 51 (1931), pp. 253-256; *Revue historique*, 173 (1934), pp. 1-31; AHES, 8 (1936), pp. 306-307].

Bloch's failed attempt to write an economic history of the Middle Ages for Berr has already been mentioned⁶⁰. As a consequence of that project, too, the historian intervened in the main problems and the principal historiographic theses. These included the one by Pirenne in *Mahomet et Charlemagne* on the isolation of the mediaeval European economy following the Arab invasion, a thesis that was "valid as a working hypothesis for the research that it prompted"⁶¹. Dopsch's thesis on the "natural or monetary" economy in the early Middle Ages was constantly discussed by Bloch in a somewhat conciliatory manner⁶², as were those of Sombart on the origins of capitalism⁶³. With regard to the problem as to whether the European economy between the years 650 and 1050 AD had really been "closed and natural", and bearing in mind Pirenne's thesis, Bloch had dedicated his own contribution to the texts in honour of Dopsch. These texts had been consigned to Austrian colleagues and were subsequently reclaimed following the *Anschluss* with the Third Reich⁶⁴.

Over the course of the discussion of these "important theories", Bloch questioned himself on the connection between economy and civilisation in Europe. This same question, and in particular the study of monetary phenomena,⁶⁵ has continued to prompt research up to contemporary issues. Bloch's scientific orientation (in the sense of the social sciences) was made perfectly clear by his fascination with the history of prices and the research by Simiand. What did matter were general trends shown in a series of comparative and cross-referenced data, the changes that occur in general phases, even without "regular causality", when external and independent events set the wheels of economic development in motion⁶⁶.

In the texts on monetary history, such as *L'Esquisse d'une histoire monétaire de l'Europe*, the historian's interest concentrated on the difference between monetary stock and the volume of commerce, and particularly on the effects of a dearth of money. The turning point in European history began in the eighteenth century when just such a dearth of money was finally overcome, thanks to a series of

⁶⁰ Four parts of this, edited in a near definitive form, were published by Febvre in AESC, (1947), pp. 30-43, 161-170 (= MH, pp. 261-286, as to how ancient slavery came to an end); RSH, 60 (1945), pp. 55-81 (= MH, 90-109, on the Barbaric invasions); AHS, 4 (1945), 2, pp. 13-28, (= MH, pp. 130-141, on invasions and occupation of the land and the population); AHS, 4 (1945), 1, pp. 33-46 (= MH, pp. 114-129, on the invasions, and Roman and Germanic economic structure). It was the author's explicit wish that these parts be printed in the "Testament" of 1938 [in CMB, 2 (1995), p. 17].

⁶¹ AHES, 10 (1938), p. 326. Bloch asked that the hypothesis of a "progressive decline", rather than a "collapse" in the European economic climate be considered.

⁶² On the books by A. Dopsch cf. Bloch's notes in MH, pp. 61-74 (1926; origins of the early mediaeval European society); MH, pp. 142-154 (1923; on the *capitulare de villis*); MH, pp. 155-176, (1926; on royal carolingian domains).

⁶³ On Sombart's research and its importance to Bloch (in particular the six volumes of *Der Moderne Kapitalismus*, 1902-1928) cf. Ch. Morazé, 'Présence de Marc Bloch. Présentation', in Atsma and Burguière, 18 and the letters of 7 September 1930 to Boutrouche, in CMB, 4 (1966), 35.

⁶⁴ Reference to the scholar's essay, which was subsequently lost, is in a note in AHES, (1938), 329. Cf. H. Dopsch, 'Marc Bloch et les Mélanges en l'honneur d'Alfons Dopsch', in Atsma and Burguière, pp. 65-72 (with the text of the letter with Bloch's motivation).

⁶⁵ M. Bloch, *Le problème de l'or au Moyen Âge*, in MH (1933), pp. 839-867 (the cit. is on p. 839). Other notes and reviews by Bloch on money: AHES 2 (1930), pp. 443-445; AHES, 3 (1931), pp. 607-608; AHES 4 (1932), pp. 511-512; AHES, 5 (1933), pp. 607-609; AHES, 6 (1934), pp. 383-387; AHES, 7 (1935); pp. 323-325; AHES 10 (1938), pp. 358-363; MHS (1942), 1, pp. 90-93.

⁶⁶ Cf. J. Day, 'The history of money in the writings of Marc Bloch', in *Problems of mediaeval coinage in the Iberian area*, ed. by M. Gomez Marques, M. Crusafont i Sabater (Aviles: Instituto de Sintra, 1986), vol. II, p. 20.

manoeuvres in methods of payment, such as money orders, deposit certificates, bills of exchange, banknotes and non-convertible cheques. It was at this time that the ever increasingly complex system that was to characterise modern capitalism came into being, the “perpetual anticipation on the future”; “a system that would fall apart in the event of the simultaneous settlement of all debts”.

An entry in Bloch’s notebook entitled *Mea* in December 1940 indicated his intention to write several books: *Apologie pour l’histoire*; a detective novel; and an *Histoire de la monnaie française*. From his correspondence with Febvre, it would appear that his research on monetary history in 1943 was the final archive research completed by Bloch. It is, however, impossible to be precise on this point. The period had already begun, in which, with the expression “archive research”, the historian was alluding in code to the clandestine missions carried out by the Resistance.

The historian in the city

1. *The Founding of the Annales*

The planning and commencement of the *Annales* were a fundamental point in the “political” overhaul of history, envisaged by Bloch and Febvre. The undertaking was never considered by the two directors to be solely a historical review. It was an instrument to provoke a change in studies, and to lead this transformation in history. It was certainly concerned, above all else, with the organisation and promotion of studies in economic history, which were very behind in France. But the original plan for the journal had been much more far-reaching. In the first place, it was to provide an opening for contemporary arguments, usually dismissed by historians, and secondly, it was to opt for a non-specialist and non-academic “style”, which would be of great interest to a public of “men of action”⁶⁷.

It should be emphasised that this was a difficult and totally innovative decision for a historical review. The field of history was extended up to the present (although this was not new) and brought to the attention of a non-specialist public (and even this was not a new concept). What was, however, completely original, was that this enterprise intended to be an organisation in a very modern sense of the term. This implied a precise division of duties and a concerted effort at editorial propaganda (the myth that grew up around the *Annales* was born at the same time as the review). It was the creation of a group of both historians and “men of action”, with a common turn of mind, able to be involved as an active part of a collaborative effort, and not just as members of the public. They were scholars from other disciplines, managers, economists, bankers and high ranking civil servants⁶⁸.

⁶⁷ As Bloch writes to the German historian Rörig on 29 May 1929, “we are not a specialist journal”: cf. *Marc Bloch-Fritz Rörig: correspondence (1928-1932)*, ed. by P. Schöttler in CMB, 1 (1994), p.22. For a good reconstruction of the history of the first editions of the *Annales*, other than studies already cited above, p. 15, note 23, cf. the introduction by B. Müller, in *Marc Bloch, Lucien Febvre, et les “Annales d’histoire économique et sociale”*. *Correspondance*, vol. 1, *La naissance des Annales, 1928-1933*, ed. by B. Müller (Paris: Fayard, 1994), pp. V-LV.

⁶⁸ Other news of Bloch’s undertaking in “Annales” (gathered from Bloch’s papers written with his collaborators and Febvre) in M. Mastrogregori, *Il genio dello storico* (Napoli-Roma: Edizioni scientifiche italiane, 1987), pp. 168-190.

2. *Historians in the workshop*

At the end of 1932 Bloch proposed, unsuccessfully, that the editor Gallimard publish a collection of his articles on method, under the title of *Historians in the Workshop* (*Historiens à l'atelier*). The draft, which can be found amongst the historian's papers, provided for the reprinting of several of his articles and reviews. Amongst these were the one on the comparative history of European society, his reflections on the false news of the war, the review of Halbwachs' book on collective memory, and the portraits of G. Wells, of George Unwin and of Georg von Below⁶⁹.

This attempt, which was both scientific and secular, to reform the study of history followed various paths. Firstly there was the journal containing his notes and critical reviews (in the first year alone, the *Annales* printed two hundred and fifty pages of critical review, written on the whole by the directors). Secondly, there were the teaching projects for the Collège de France; and finally, there was the volumes in which Bloch proposed to a large public a new vision of the questions studied by the historians, suggesting new methods of approach and, above all, a comparative method in the study of European society.

Bloch was well aware that a journal containing his critical notes and reviews, a collection of volumes, plus the possibility of promoting new research or the creation of a research institute would find a far greater readership and result in a rapidity of action far superior to the impact that any revolutionary history book might create. However, the political atmosphere in Europe and France, where these projects were taking shape, became, in the course of the 1930s, increasingly gloomy. Bloch met with anti-Semitism in the French university environment, be it during his failed attempts to teach at the Collège de France or when he put himself forward as successor to Celestin Bouglé for the directorship of the École Normale Supérieure⁷⁰.

It was the review *Annales*, in fact, that, during the course of the 1930s, became the strong point in the defence of Bloch's innovative strategies, notwithstanding his growing differences with Febvre. The special issue of 1937 on Nazi Germany led to the rescinding of his contract with the publisher Colin in the following year. After a bitter discussion as to the future direction of the journal, in the summer of 1938, the two directors decided to immediately go ahead with its publication under the new title of *Annales d'histoire sociale*⁷¹.

3. *Strange Defeat*

Following the devastating experience of the campaign in Flanders, Bloch spent the summer of 1940 writing a book on French defeat. *Témoignage écrit en 1940* was

⁶⁹ The historian's planned collection was published with additions, and edited by E. Bloch, in 1995: M. Bloch, *Histoire et historiens* (Paris: A. Colin, 1995). Cf. also the important afterword by P. Schöttler in the German edition, 'Späne aus der Werkstatt eines Historikers', in M. Bloch, *Aus der Werkstatt des Historikers* (Frankfurt-Paris: Campus-Maison des sciences de l'homme, 2000), pp. 319-361.

⁷⁰ Both the cited cases were only a prologue of the drama that was to come about in the spring of 1941 when, as a result of the racist legislation of the Vichy Government, problems such as those encountered by the *Annales d'histoire sociale* arose. Cf. *infra*, pp. 126-128.

⁷¹ Cf. Müller, *Marc Bloch et les années trente*, p. 167. On the rescission of the contract with Colin and the discussion between the two directors, cf. Fink, 160-162. On Bloch's political thinking, a man of the left and at the same time in favour of order, information provided by E. Bloch can be found in, 'Souvenirs et réflexions d'un fils sur son père', in Atsma and Burguière, 23-38.

the actual title of the book written by Bloch between July and September (it was published in 1946, under the title of *Strange Defeat: a statement of evidence written in 1940*)⁷². The imaginary setting of the book was a court case, and the historian undertook to give evidence (it should, however, be remembered that, during that same summer, Bloch, in his capacity as an army captain, and at the request of the military General Staff, had in reality to compile a detailed report on his own operation. This was in the context of an enquiry into the technical reasons for the defeat, and into the “lessons of the war”).

Bloch wrote at a time when lack of knowledge and a deliberate distortion of the facts were beginning to stir up a lot of trouble concerning the defeat, and so his intervention arrived at a crucial moment in the transmission of recollections of events. They were not, however, personal memories (“It is no part of my intention to produce a book of reminiscences”) – which are of little importance and only “touch on the picturesque and the mood of the time” – but collective memories. In order to proceed correctly with the composition of these recollections, Bloch appeared in the first chapter as a witness. “I am a writer and teacher of history”, he stated; “I have tried to observe and criticise the tragic events. I have fought two wars”; that, in itself, was fairly exceptional. I am Jewish, but above all I am French (“I have made France’s history my own”). “Finally I have a distinct military leaning (I therefore served willingly in the army and am not deliberately critical)”.

Upon presentation of the evidence he weighed up with precision all that he had done and seen during the war; places, days and people. He specifically stated which facts were dependent upon the testimony of others. He carefully circumscribed his personal experience, clearly indicated the limitations of his testimony (for example, he listed in minute detail the documents that he had to burn; the green exercise book and the correspondence). In the second chapter he then began his deposition (*One of the vanquished gives evidence*) but, in this imaginary court case, he was at the same time the examining magistrate, putting the questions and collecting the proof.

The military command was responsible for the defeat, which was due to insufficient planning. “The triumph of the Germans”, wrote Bloch, “was essentially an intellectual victory and this is possibly the most serious fact”. The two adversaries belonged to different epochs. The history that inspired the French command (a history defined as misleading by some of the officers belonging to school of war) was not realistic or true-to-life history.

In the third chapter (*A Frenchman examines his conscience*) the witness-magistrate became the defendant. In a nation, no one professional body had an autonomous moral responsibility. A collective, and extremely powerful solidarity, and the responsibilities of the military general staff were intertwined with those of the various groups of French people. The intellectual causes of the defeat, therefore, went far beyond the military planning. For too long, the elite classes in French society had been content with incomplete knowledge and insufficiently lucid notions.

⁷² Bloch, *The strange defeat* cit. The textual tradition of this work seemed to be known (for the account by Ph. Arbos cf. Bloch, *La strana disfatta*, p. 33). But the existence of a file of the testimony hidden in the historian’s archives and the presence of a folder of unpublished *Notes* saved by Bloch should reopen a veritable discussion on the text of the work. On the documents hidden by Bloch in his archives after April 1942 cf. M. Mastrogregori, ‘Due carnets inediti di Marc Bloch (1917-1973): “Quelques notes de lecture” and “Mea”’, *Rivista storica italiana*, 110 (1998), 3, pp. 1009-1010; on the folder of unpublished notes cf. Raulff, 38-39; Audoin-Rouzeau, 28n, 29n, 30n.

Eventually, at the end of this imaginary court case, Bloch, the witness-examining magistrate-defendant, transformed himself into the judge and condemned himself together with the rest of his generation. "We knew", confessed the historian, "that in a new war, a renewed windstorm", the European civilisation, would run the risk of disappearing for all time. But we dared not stand up in public and be the voice crying out, initially in the wilderness; however, whatever the ultimate outcome, we would have had the consolation of knowing that we had shouted our beliefs out loud"⁷³.

The guilt of Bloch's defendant was not moral, but rather intellectual. He had failed to make good use of history. Therefore, it was not the law, as it would have been in an actual court of law, which prompted Judge Bloch's sentence. History should have been the enlightenment of the intelligence and, as such, an irreplaceable intellectual technique and grounds for civil action in democratic times. The *Statement of evidence* was a splendid defence of this kind of history, an act of faith –bitter and sad, indeed- in its democratic value.

4. A notebook: *Mea*.

In his mind, Bloch remained undecided as to whether to choose the path of action or that of history without seeing an apparent contradiction in terms between the two. It was in this state of uncertainty that his final works took shape: the *Témoignage* on the French defeat, and *Apologie pour l'histoire*. In both of these works, the vision of the value and the necessity of historical method and criticism were dominant, and formed the conclusive reference. It was evident from his first work that this vision was to be highly praised; a vision that was subsequently to be defended, discussed and historically accepted, as will be seen with regard to the second work. But Bloch's ultimate work is more than just this exaltation of history as an intellectual technique, and of criticism as being of value.

If we open the unpublished notebook entitled *Mea*, into which the historian transcribed a hundred or so quotations and reading notes from October 1940, the entries became varied. The horizons broadened unexpectedly, reaching far beyond the bounds of the problems of civil action translated into terms of knowledge, or the problems of historical science in the context of civil action, as described in those two works⁷⁴.

5. *The Interrupted Manuscript of Apologie pour l'histoire ou Métier d'historien*

It was in the notebook entitled *Mea*, at the top of a list of books written in December 1940, that *Apologie pour l'histoire* was mentioned. This work, therefore, came into being during the critical situation of radical uncertainty between the autumn of 1940 and June 1943.

⁷³ Bloch, *La strana disfatta*, p. 156.

⁷⁴ Cf. Mastrogregori, 'Due carnets inediti', in particular, p. 1015 foll. (the integral description of the contents of the notebook at pp. 1032 foll.) *Mea* ("things that belong to me") contains passages from works by Corneille, Descartes, Lamennais, Cournot, Hegel, Barrès, Loisy, Bossuet, Constant, De Maistre, Meinecke, Hume, Maritain, Michelet, Spinoza, Fontenelle, Valéry, Erasmo, Renan, Péguy, Sismondi, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Ronsard, Keynes, Turgot, Herder, Durkheim, Chateaubriand, Bergson, Cabanis, D'Alembert, Sainte-Beuve, Thomas More, Machiavelli, Marlowe, Goethe, Montalembert, Saint-Evrémond, Platone, and S. Agostino.

In *The Historian's Craft*, Bloch seriously discussed, in depth and in breadth, the intrinsic problems of intellectual legitimacy and the use of history. His basic strategy was to offer people who were not historians a lively description of the way in which historians worked (amongst other things, the book opened with the childish question "What is the use of history?"). Frequently, though, breaches in genuine history suddenly appeared - simple examples, of course, but drawn from reliable sources - in which the author suggested that the passage of time played a part with regard to the particular aspect under discussion.

Thus, from the very beginning, the historian made the point that the problem of the legitimacy of history was not only of interest to the body of historians, but to our civilisation in general, and beyond. At a later stage, he went back over the text to clarify what he meant, with a new development of the characteristics of history. As opposed to other cultures, Bloch maintained that our own had always been very reliant on its own memory. All the components of our culture, Christian as well as ancient inheritance, had led to this. Not only were the Greeks and the Romans "a population of historians"; the same could be said of Christianity, which was a "historical" religion, as opposed to other religious systems that were founded on mythology beyond a human level. Its holy books were "history books", the Christian liturgy was a record of past events and, finally, for Christians, the drama of humanity took place in time and was of a predetermined duration⁷⁵. "Our art, our literature", Bloch continued, "both are full of the echoes of the past, and men of action frequently cite the lessons of history, whether real or supposed".

In the first chapter, devoted to the discussion of historical time and the "vertical" and "horizontal" relationship between the facts, Bloch returned to his affirmation of the historical nature of the Christian civilisation. With regard to the tendency to give privilege to the study of the origins of historical phenomena ("the idol of the origins"), Bloch criticised the indifference of Barrès to the reconstruction of tradition performed by Renan, (as he had done in *Mea*), and quoted Maurras's remark on the gospels, the works of "four obscure Hebrews". "Pascal and Bossuet", he quickly added, "would not have spoken like that". One could conceive a religious experience that owed nothing to history (to the deist, interior illumination was sufficient), but this was not the case with Christianity: in the *Credo* the beginnings of faith were also its foundation.

6. *The Arms*

Therefore, according to the author, what purpose did a book on history serve? Bloch wrote this, in spite of the difficulties that have been described, with a mind to the public that the *Annales* were hoping to win over, in other words, the readership of *Regards sur le monde actuel* by Paul Valéry. He wanted to point out an urgent problem to this public, which his acute view as a historian and man of action allowed him to see clearly, but which others did not see and would not have seen even later (in 1942, Louis Halphen, Charles Seignobos, Anatole de Monzie and even Raymond

⁷⁵ This is not the only passage in which, towards the end of his life, Bloch acknowledged the importance of the Christian civilisation. Besides a few remarks in the notebook *Mea*, the review by Georges Dumézil should be cited, 'Mythes et dieux des Germains', *Revue historique*, 188 (1940), pp. 274-276, in which one of the characteristic elements of Nazism is its marginalisation from the Christian tradition.

Queneau were to ponder and write on the utility of history).⁷⁶ It concerned the problem, which implicated many other issues, related to the action of the historical and critical method in the “City at the service of people”, as Bloch efficaciously wrote⁷⁷. Secondly, there was the problem of the power of memories, and the weight of the past on the present; the present in which choices were made.

The historian translated this problem into two specific questions: intellectual legitimacy of history as a scientific discipline, and the utility of the study of history for society. In all the descriptive part of the manuscript left to Fougères, which was largely what remained, Bloch tackled the first question, that of the intellectual legitimacy. He tried to “weigh up with a degree of certainty” the merit of the historical method, demonstrating “how and why a historian practises his craft. “It is up to the reader”, he wrote at a certain point, “to decide if this craft deserves to be practised”. But the question that really drove him to write the book was the second (that of the utility of history).

The book was to remain unfinished; the parts on “prevision and history” and on “the historian in the city” are no more than headings in the draft. However, a response to this problem was given all the same, as we have tried to demonstrate, in an indirect way in *Strange defeat*, in a fragmentary way in the notebook entitled *Mea*, and in an explicitly political way in the clandestine writings. There emerged from these collected texts an ideal of critical consciousness, beneficial to the taking of action. On the basis of this, Bloch, together with the historian Michelet, appeared able to say “I believed in the future because I was creating it myself”. The reasons also emerged for his going into action and supporting a revolution that he certainly had in his sights. These were, in particular, the reintroduction of republican legality in the history of France, the liberation of the motherland from the occupation, and also the creation of new conditions for the citizens’ future⁷⁸.

The new science of history sought to realise that ideal of critical consciousness. History ensured the knowledge of social structures and their metamorphoses. It corrected the errors in transmission and recording of reminiscences, both individual and collective, promoted a sense of diversity between past and present, exposed falsehood and lies, and contributed to the avoidance of the repetition of the past and the “anachronisms of action”. At the centre of the relationship between society and the past, there had to be, according to Bloch, this critical awareness. History needed to come out of the enclosed environment of academic institutions and “know how to talk to scholars and children alike. Since civilisations can change, it is not inconceivable that our own civilisation might one day turn its back on history. Historians would do well to reflect on this. Good history could certainly become involved in the eventual discredit of a badly conceived historical work, if a reme-

⁷⁶ Cf. Louis Halphen, *Introduction à l'histoire* (Paris : PUF, 1946) ; Anatole de Monzie, *Pétitions pour l'histoire*, (Paris : Flammarion, 1942) (contains evident traces of suggestions by Febvre) ; for Seignobos cf. R. Fawtier, ‘La dernière lettre de Ch. Seignobos à F. Lot’, *Revue historique*, 210 (1953), 1-12. Queneau started to write, in July 1942, a *Brouillon projet d'une atteinte à une science absolue de l'histoire*, subsequently abandoned (after the first 96 brief chapters).

⁷⁷ Bloch, *L'étrange défaite*, p. 215.

⁷⁸ For a demonstration of this point cf. Mastrogregori, ‘Due carnets inediti’, pp. 1024-1025 (also for the origins of Renan and Jaurès in this revolutionary spirit of Bloch). The pronounced revolutionary character of Bloch’s final days is clearly seen in his clandestine writings published in *Cahiers politiques*, a Resistance journal (and republished in Bloch, *La strana disfatta*, pp. 167-213), in particular *La vera stagione dei giudici* and the *Note per una rivoluzione dell'insegnamento*.

dy is not imposed. However, if we should ever reach that point, it would be at the cost of a profound and brutal rupture with our most constant values and intellectual traditions”.

In the meantime, however, it was not just the intellectual traditions that were being violently destroyed around the historian. The uncompleted book by Bloch was born of this situation, which, after a slow depletion of his strength, found Bloch in state of exhaustion as a result of his experience as a scholar and professor, and even as a result of the unexpected change in the nature of his action. The solution that could be read into this, that history is a useful critical tool, the correction of errors, the revolution in traditions, the analysis of social structures, was unthinkable without the advent of a new era and a superior future civilisation at the end of one of the most formidable crises in the history of Europe.

Confronted with reality, in face of conflict, confronted with forms of dominion and his own contagious capacities of widespread persuasion, in face of authority and struggle for the power of tradition, this solution would appear to have been a heroic but ineffectual ideal. At this moment, the manuscript was interrupted and Bloch returned to fight for the town, using other weapons.

The legacy

A first glance at the overall picture might lead one to believe that the opinion on Bloch's work was uniformly positive, with a growing consensus of readers and historians alike. His work underwent no dramatic change of pace or loss of interest; there were no sudden revivals or sensational promotions.

His contemporaries, or rather the teachers, colleagues, rivals, and readers, saw in Bloch an innovative scholar, who was authoritative and internationally acclaimed. The *Rois thaumaturges* was received as a masterpiece of erudition and interpretation of information sources. The *Caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française* was regarded as a turning point in the agrarian history of France, and the *Société Féodale*, notwithstanding the criticism of the overall equilibrium of the work, was seen as the consecration of the great mediaeval scholar. In an international context, Bloch was a mediator between French and German studies (the lengthy literary discussion on the *Revue Historique*). He represented France at international historical conferences, lectured in prestigious seats of learning such as The London School of Economics and Cambridge University, where he was introduced to the audience as the greatest living authority on the Middle Ages.

Even after his death, his books remained in circulation and were reprinted and translated into the principle languages of the cultured world. Over the years “a quasi unanimity” had grown up on the scientific value of Bloch's works, now regarded as classics of historiography and widely used in universities. Influential mediaeval scholars such as Georges Duby and Jacques Le Goff looked to Bloch as the “indirect”, but determinant factor in their education. In addition, even after a lapse of many years, and in a greatly altered scientific context, it could not be said that his approach to wide-ranging historical problems such as feudalism, manoir, mediaeval servitude, and the relationship between the Roman and Germanic worlds in the late Middle Ages was outdated. Bloch still figured as a cogent and persuasive author, rather than a renowned but rarely read ancestor.

However, on closer examination, the opinion on the historian appeared less uniform with differing assessments. Two historical facts that are, however, related, paint a different picture to the one so far described, and allow us to see a different landscape. These were the history of the *Annales* (from the review and the research group which grew from it) and the mutual relationship of strength between history and the social sciences.

In light of this, the judgement by his contemporaries on his major works would appear to be ambiguous. To treat Bloch as a master of erudition and criticism; as a scholar of mediaeval studies of great technical stature, meant wisely and cautiously leaving an important aspect of his innovative and creative project in the shadows. This was the transformation of history into a comparative science of social phenomena, which implied the definitive rejection of "history as defined by Herodotos" and the disciplinary and chronological bounds (Bloch had never considered himself to be a mediaeval scholar in the strict sense of the term)⁷⁹.

The works of Bloch and the memory of the scholar and man of action were mainly introduced by Febvre, and then by Braudel, as part of a strategy for the creation of a powerful research institute in the field of human science. This was partly concerned with the execution of a project, which was jointly conceived by Febvre and Bloch: the "Société Henri Pirenne pour l'étude de l'histoire économique". This had been planned by them, in the years between 1936 and 1939, and then evolved as the "Association Marc Bloch", but still with the same aims. "You, Bloch and I are all here to serve the SAME CAUSE", Febvre wrote to Berr on March 12, 1947. It is worth noting that he used the present tense, as if Bloch were still alive.

The inclusion by Bloch in the institutional strategies of the *Annales*, the symbolic "presence" of the martyred historian, and this instrumented revival were hardly compatible with a philological stance. This, therefore, resulted in a profuse inattention to both the concrete and literary characteristics of Bloch's work. The abundance of material deposited by Bloch's family with the École Normale Supérieure was not consulted (also, some of this material subsequently disappeared). A few of the texts that were ready for printing, such as the chapters on the history of mediaeval economy, were published in the *Annales*. Other work was also published: series, conference material and evidence, but in most cases it was published without an introduction. The case of his book on history was of particular significance. *The Historian's Craft* became a symbolic work rather than a text to read attentively. In a brief period of time it lost its own literal significance. It had come into being at the same time that the organisation of research for the *Annales* was taking place. It had been read, distributed, translated and promoted, above all in connection with the activities of the *Annales* "school", which had not even existed as a project when the text had been written.

Up until the end of the sixties, in fact, Febvre and Braudel kept the mythical figure of Bloch in the limelight, at times expressly, with a view to the expansion of the school of the *Annales*. Febvre recalled his friend voluntarily putting himself in the front line, whilst Braudel remembered him as the prudent student of Lucien Febvre.

⁷⁹ Cf. BH, 180 (1937), 4; "The classification of flowery (*la flore*) is descriptive; the physiology of plants interprets. In history, we are still really at the stage of description and, what is more, of a *flore* that, due to our failure to dissect it, is resigned to study only the most external characteristics of flowers".

The idea, typical of Braudel, that social science should be an auxiliary branch of history became retroactively attributed to the Bloch-Febvre partnership.

The situation underwent a change with the arrival of the third generation of *Annales* historians, from Jacques Le Goff to André Burguière and Jacques Revel. It was not only the interest in mentalities and the proposal of method in historical anthropology that brought about a re-emergence of the Bloch of *Royal touch* and *Feudal society* (whilst, as far as Braudel was concerned, Bloch's masterpiece was "without doubt" the book on the history of rural France). It was also the diverse configuration of the relationship between history and social science, the return of narration, biography and political history that favoured the creation of an image of Bloch that was much closer to historical reality.

The historian's personage seemed to take on a more distinct contour when the relationship between history and social science once more became problematic, following the periods of the consolidation of the review under Febvre's care, and the "imperialist" expansionism of Braudel.

During the course of the 1990s, Bloch was portrayed as the standard-bearer of the *Annales* and an acclaimed mediaeval scholar, as well as an innovative historian of society and economy, a talented precursor in the field of historical anthropology, and a problem for historiography. In addition to these four portrayals, a fifth could be added: Marc Bloch as a symbol; the citizen-historian-soldier, the hero of conscience. He became a mythical figure, the recipient of impressive citations. Through his exemplary reviews and texts on method, and his propositions on the civil use of history, he was in a position to respectively heap criticism on, and at the same time redeem, the entire body of historians suffering from an identity crisis.

However, it is now important to draw attention to Bloch's works, whether published or left unpublished in his workshop, and to the meaning of some aspects of his work as a historian (I am thinking particularly of his concepts of "historical experiment" and "social structure"). Without directly referring to the Enlightenment tradition, around which a new picture was beginning to emerge, particularly in the 1930s, which were a crucial period for our author, Bloch managed to distance himself from Romanticism, and deliberately ignored the historicistic revision of romantic culture. He attempted to develop, the concept of a social human science in a totally original form, without falling into a positivist naivety, or into the systematic and clearly defined imperialism proposed by Durkheim. It was an idea, as the passage of time has shown, that had a future, at least as far as the convergence of differing disciplines was concerned (fortunately exactly as had happened at the research institute of the *Annales* and the *École des hautes études en sciences sociales*). It was a new approach to history, well ahead of its time, and in the main this is still the case.

Chronology

1886. Born 6 July in Lyons to Gustave Bloch, Professor of Ancient History at the University of Lyons, and Sarah Ebstein, both from families of Jewish origin, respectively from Alsace and Lyons.
- 1912-1913. Professor of History and Geography at the Lycée in Montpellier.
- 1913-1914. Professor of History and Geography at the Lycée in Amiens. In July 1914, he made a speech on the occasion of the end of year prize-giving ceremony, entitled *Critique historique et critique du témoignage*.
- 1914-1918. Mobilised on 2 August 1914 and served as a sergeant in the infantry, spending the rest of the war, save for brief interruptions, at the battlefield. By the end of the war, he had obtained the grade of captain. He was decorated with the *Croix de Guerre* and the *Légion d'Honneur*.
1919. Appointed to the course of mediaeval studies at the Faculty of Arts at the University of Strasbourg, where he met Lucien Febvre. Married Simonne Vidal on 13 July in Paris. Six children were to be born of this marriage.
1924. Published, in Strasbourg, *Les rois thaumaturges. Etude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale, particulièrement en France et en Angleterre*. He undertook to consign to two volumes on the economic history of mediaeval Europe to Berr, for the collection *L'évolution de l'humanité*.
1929. Founded and, together with Febvre, undertook the direction of a publication entitled 'Annales d'histoire économique et sociale', for which he promoted scientific research, sought out noteworthy contributors and, up until 1944, wrote numerous articles and dozens of commentaries and reviews. He held a series of conferences on the history of rural France in Oslo, at the Institute of Comparative Study of Civilisations.
1931. Published *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*. He was thwarted in his attempt to return to Paris (his candidature for the fourth section of the École pratique des hautes études having been rejected).
1936. He was called on to teach at the Sorbonne and thus became the holder of the only Chair of economic history in French academic system.
1939. Mobilised as a volunteer on 23 August, and travelled to Strasbourg and then Molsheim. He was transferred to the High Command of the First Armoured Division and spent the 'drôle de guerre' in Bohain. Publication of the first volume of *Société Féodale*.
1940. Participated, between May and June, in military operations as an officer assigned to the provisioning of the motorised divisions. After the armistice, he and his family took refuge in their country house. Publication of the second volume of *Société Féodale*. Between July and September, he wrote a testimony on the defeat of the French, published under the title of *L'Étrange Défaite* in 1946 by Atlas Editions, which had been created from the 'Franc-Tireurs' movement.
- 1940-1914. He was removed from the Faculty of Arts at the University of Strasbourg and transferred to Clermond-Ferrand.
1941. Bloch was transferred to the University of Montpellier. At the insistence of Febvre, he gave up his directorship and ownership of the 'Annales' (as it would otherwise have been classified as a Jewish enterprise). The publication, under Febvre's directorship in Paris, continued to circulate, but without Bloch's name.
1943. Between March and June, he went into hiding and joined the 'Franc-Tireurs' movement. Under the successive pseudonyms of Chevreuse, Arpajon, Narbonne and M. Blanchard, he became heavily involved in the Resistance movement and prepared plans for an insurrection in the Lyons region.
1944. Bloch was arrested by the Gestapo on 8 March and interned and tortured in the prison of Montluc. On the evening of 16 June, he was removed from the prison, together with 29 other prisoners, and driven 30 or so kilometres outside Lyons. There, in a roadside field at Saint-Didier-de-Formans, he was killed under the fire of German machine guns.

Selected bibliography

1. Bibliographies

Marie-Claire Gasnault-Beis, 'Bibliographie [des travaux de Marc Bloch]', in Marc Bloch, *Mélanges historiques*, vol. 2 (Paris: S. Fleury-EHESS, 1983), pp. 1031-1104 (to be read in conjunction with the observations of Carlo Ginzburg, 'A proposito della raccolta dei saggi storici di Marc Bloch', in *Studi medievali*, 6 (1965), 335-354).
'Bibliographie des travaux sur Marc Bloch 1944-1994', in *Cahiers Marc Bloch*, 2 (1995), 25-37.
'Bibliographie Marc Bloch (suite)' in *Cahiers Marc Bloch*, 3 (1995), 109; 4 (1996), 101; 5 (1997), 89-90.

2. Works by Marc Bloch

a. Books

L'Ile-de-France (les pays autour de Paris) (Paris: L. Cerf, 1913).
Rois et serfs, un chapitre d'histoire capétienne (Paris: Champion, 1920); new edition, including the collected texts on medieval servitude: *Rois et serfs, un chapitre d'histoire capétienne et autres écrits sur le servage*, afterword by Dominique Barthélemy (Paris: La Boutique de l'Histoire, 1996).
Les rois thaumaturges. Étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre (Strasbourg: Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, 1924); new edition, with preface by J. Le Goff (Paris: Gallimard, 1983).
Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française (Oslo-Paris: Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1931; with pref. by Pierre Toubert, Paris: A. Colin, 1988).
La société féodale, t. 1: *La formation des liens de dépendance* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1939); t. 2: *Les classes et le gouvernement des hommes* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1940; ed. with pref. by R. Fossier, Paris: Albin Michel, 1989).
Aspects économiques du règne de Louis XIV, ed. by P. Heumann (Paris: Tournier et Constans, 1939) (prescribed university course reading).

b. Posthumous Works

L'étrange défaite (Paris: Société des éditions 'Le Franc-Tireur', 1946; pref. by Stanley Hoffmann, Paris: Gallimard, 1990).
Apologie pour l'histoire ou Métier d'historien, ed. by Lucien Febvre (Paris: A. Colin, 1949); new edition with preface by Georges Duby (Paris: A. Colin, 1974); new text ed. by Etienne Bloch, with preface by Jacques Le Goff (Paris: A. Colin, 1993); abridged edition for students, with revised preface by Jacques Le Goff (Paris: A. Colin, 1997).
Esquisse d'une histoire monétaire de l'Europe, with preface by Lucien Febvre and postscript by Fernand Braudel (Paris: A. Colin, 1954).
La France sous les derniers Capétiens (1223-1328), with preface by Fernand Braudel (Paris: A. Colin, 1958).
Seigneurie française et manoir anglais, with preface by Georges Duby (Paris: A. Colin, 1960).
Souvenirs de Guerre 1914-1915 (Paris: A. Colin, 1969).

c. Collected articles

Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française. II. Supplément établi d'après les travaux de l'auteur (1931-1944), ed. by Robert Marie Dauvergne (Paris: A. Colin, 1956).
L'individualisme agraire dans la France du XVIII^e siècle (Brionne: Gérard Montfort, 1978).
Mélanges historiques, ed. by Charles Edmond Perrin, 2 vols (Paris: S. Fleury-EHESS, 1983).

Histoire et historiens, ed. by Etienne Bloch (Paris: A. Colin, 1995).

Écrits de guerre, 1914-1918, ed. by Etienne Bloch, with introduction by Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau (Paris: A. Colin, 1997).

La terre et les paysans. Agriculture et vie rurale aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles, ed. by Etienne Bloch (Paris: A. Colin, 1999).

d. Correspondence

Lucien Febvre, 'Témoignages sur la période 1939-1940. Extraits d'une correspondance intime', in *Annales d'histoire sociale*, 1 (1945), 15-32.

'Letters to America: the correspondence of Marc Bloch, 1940-1941', ed. by Peter M. Rutkoff, Walter B. Scott, in *French Historical Studies*, 12 (1981), 277-303.

The Birth of Annales history: the letters of Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch to Henri Pirenne (1921-1935), ed. by Bryce and Mary Lyon (Brussels: Commission Royale d'Histoire, 1991).

'Marc Bloch à Etienne Bloch, lettres de la drôle de guerre', ed. by François Bédarida and Denis Peschanski, in *Les cahiers de l'IHTP*, 19 (1991).

Écrire La société féodale: lettres à Henri Berr, 1924-1943, ed. by Jacqueline Pluet-Despatin (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1992).

Marc Bloch, Lucien Febvre et les Annales d'histoire économique et sociale. Correspondance, vol. 1: La naissance des Annales, 1928-1933, ed. by Bertrand Müller (Paris: Fayard, 1994).

'Marc Bloch-Fritz Rörig: correspondance (1928-1932)', ed. by Peter Schöttler, in *Cahiers Marc Bloch*, 1 (1994), 17-52.

'Lettres à Paul de Rousiers (1928)', ed. by A. Savoye, in *Les Etudes sociales*, 124 (1996), 65-70.

'Lettres à Robert Boutrouche (1930-1943)', ed. by Etienne Bloch and Bertrand Müller, in *Cahiers Marc Bloch*, 4 (1996), 25-98.

'Lettres à Richard Koebner (1931-1934)', ed. by Peter Schöttler, in *Cahiers Marc Bloch*, 5 (1997), 73-82 (in folders 6-7 of the *Cahiers Marc Bloch*, the publication of the letters to Gustave Cohen, 1923-1925, and to Kanichi Asakawa, 1919-1935 has been announced).

3. Works on Marc Bloch

Massimo Mastrogregori, *Il genio dello storico. Le considerazioni sulla storia di Marc Bloch e Lucien Febvre e la tradizione metodologica francese* (Napoli-Roma: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1987).

Carole Fink, *Marc Bloch. A life in history* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Marc Bloch aujourd'hui. Histoire comparée et sciences sociales, ed. by Hartmut Atsma and André Burguière (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes études en sciences sociales, 1990).

Massimo Mastrogregori, *Il manoscritto interrotto di Marc Bloch. Apologia della storia o Mestiere di storico* (Pisa-Roma: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1995).

Ulrich Raulff, *Ein Historiker im 20. Jahrhundert: Marc Bloch* (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1995).

Susan W. Friedman, *Marc Bloch, Sociology and Geography. Encountering changing disciplines* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Etienne Bloch, *Marc Bloch, 1886-1944, une biographie impossible* (Limoges: Culture et patrimoine en Limousin, 1997).

Marc Bloch, l'historien et la cité, ed. by Pierre Deyon, Jean-Claude Richez and Lévi Strauss (Strasbourg: Presses universitaires de Strasbourg, 1997).

Marc Bloch, Historiker und Widerstandskämpfer, ed. by Peter Schöttler (Frankfurt a. M.: Campus, 1999).

Olivier Dumoulin, *Marc Bloch* (Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2000).

Massimo Mastrogregori, *Introduzione a Bloch* (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2001).

Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz (1893 – 1984)

José-Luis MARTÍN

(Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia – Spain)

April 7 marked 110 years since the birth of Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz y Menduñá, throughout his life a student of the Mediaeval past who was also concerned about the future of Spain. We owe much of our knowledge of Mediaeval times to his teachings and those of his followers, trained at the universities of Barcelona, Valladolid, Madrid, Bordeaux, Mendoza, Rosario, La Plata and Buenos Aires. He also helped to build modern Spain as a Member of Parliament, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador in Lisbon and, from 1962 to 1970, Head of the Republican Government in exile.

A serious historian and an «amateur» politician who took politics seriously, Don Claudio recorded his own political activities, half in joke, half-seriously, in many articles brought together in *Espanoles ante la Historia*, *De mi anecdotario político*, *Ensayos sobre Historia de España*, *Dípticos de Historia de España*, *Mi testamento histórico-político*, *Confidencias*, *Con un pie en el estribo*, *Aún*, etc., in which we find, alongside anecdotes and reflections on Spain today, Sánchez-Albornoz's opinion of such Spanish and other European politicians as Aldo Moro, Pietro Nenni and General De Gaulle, with whom he came into contact as Head of the Government in exile, from which he would only return on the death of General Franco.

The welcome and the many tributes, distinctions and awards that Don Claudio received on his first visit to Spain after 40 years in exile were not sufficient to persuade him to establish his residence here. It took a serious illness, as he himself confessed, for him to let himself be sequestered by his own children, with whom he spent the last months of his long life in Ávila. Politics caused his birth to take place in Madrid «a day before or after his father was sworn in as a member of parliament for Ávila», according to his pupil, Hilda Grassotti, and on his death it was the politicians of Ávila who rendered the last honours to him, recognising Don Claudio's political and professional merits. In his final years and even after his death, «official» Spain could not do enough for him, facilitating the establishment of the Fundación Sánchez-Albornoz, and his mortal remains found their last resting-place before burial in the Civil Government building in Ávila. In accordance with his desire, Sánchez-Albornoz was buried in the cloister of Ávila Cathedral as the bells rang out to proclaim his death to the four winds. This desire was recorded in his acceptance speech on being made Doctor Honoris Causa by the University of Oviedo: «These things are no longer done, but, when my time comes, I would like you to ask in Ávila for the old custom to be revived and, from the heights of the flat-topped tower of Saint Peter, near my father's house, which is no longer standing, in which I played, loved, suffered and prayed, I would like the altar-boy to call out: For the soul of Don Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz, dead in Argentina, adoring Spain».

The paradox and the controversy that accompanied him in life did not leave him even in the tomb. Some Catholics, forgetting his constant professions of faith, complained that such a notorious republican should be buried in the cathedral

cloister. No doubt, they had not read his definition of himself as «a Catholic, a liberal, a democrat and a republican». As a Catholic he was buried in a holy place and as a liberal and a democrat it was his right for representatives from all the Spanish democratic parties to be present. His republicanism neither prevented the king and queen from enquiring after his health, nor did it prevent him from being awarded the «Prince of Asturias» prize and, previously, the great crosses of Alfonso X the Wise, and Charles III.

Fifty years of historical study

Vicente Ferrer, that master amongst preachers, compared the sermon, preaching, to a fisherman's net, as it is formed by a multitude of threads, each woven into the other. Much the same could also be said of Sánchez-Albornoz's work, which began in 1922 and was completed 50 years later, though new books and articles were published later that modify or corroborate some of the ideas embodied in Don Claudio's dozens of books and hundreds of articles.

Don Claudio was persuaded to undertake his first research into Mediaeval history by the teachings of Eduardo de Hinojosa, and as one of Hinojosa's pupils he was «forced» by Menéndez Pidal to write a piece worthy of the prize awarded by Parliament to celebrate the twelfth centenary of the Battle of Covadonga. Between 1921 and 1922, Sánchez-Albornoz travelled tirelessly, examining the archives in León, Astorga, Oviedo, Gijón, Lugo, Santiago, Tuy, Madrid, Lisbon, Braga... until, finally, in late 1922, he completed his study *Instituciones sociales y políticas del reino de Asturias*. The work was divided into five parts, devoted to: the political history of Asturias; institutions in the Visigoth period; the Asturian kingdom; the kingdom of León; and the church, art and letters under the rule of Oviedo. The *Instituciones* was not published until the appearance in 1972 of three volumes on *Orígenes de la nación española. Estudios críticos sobre la historia del reino de Asturias* (The origins of the Spanish nation: critical studies on the history of the Asturian kingdom).

Referring to Don Claudio's early research work, Menéndez Pidal highlights the author's sharp sense of observation, his objectivity, which does not exclude passion, the impressive documentary basis supporting it, and the depth of his judgement on the institutions of Castile and León, backed up by his comparisons with similar institutions during the Visigoth period, in the Lower Middle Ages and in contemporary Europe. Nonetheless, despite Menéndez Pidal's high opinion of Don Claudio, the initial study was not published until each of its parts had been expanded, amended, divided into many articles, the first of them (published in 1924) an in-depth study of *Las Behetrías: La encomendación en Asturias, León y Castilla*, completed three years later by *Muchas más páginas sobre las behetrías*. In these works, Sánchez-Albornoz carefully analyses the origins and evolution of the *behetría* or benefactorium contract, understood as a way in which peasants could secure the protection of the powerful. These studies introduce two important subjects that Sánchez-Albornoz will later deal with in depth: firstly, he links *behetría* with the survival of freemen at a time when Europe was distinguished by the predominance of the semi-free and serfs and, secondly, the institution of *behetría* as a form of commendation, a search for protection that lies at the heart of feudalism.

The existence of freemen in western kingdoms in the Peninsula is a central theme in Don Claudio's work, and to a large extent the use of one system or another to populate occupied land depends on whether such people existed. Don Claudio analyses these questions in his works on *La repoblación del reino asturleonés* (1936), *Despoblación y repoblación del valle del Duero* (1966) and *Pequeños propietarios libres en el reino asturleonés: su realidad histórica* (1966). Sánchez-Albornoz soon became interested in the origins of feudalism, and he returned to the subject on many occasions: his major contribution to the theme is found in his study *En torno a los orígenes del feudalismo* (1942), in which he demonstrates the weaknesses of Brunner's theories about the influence of Hispano-Muslim cavalry in the origins of French feudalism; Sánchez-Albornoz does not restrict himself to disproving Brunner's theories, however, but seeks to demonstrate that Visigoth Spain was becoming feudal long before the Moors disembarked on the Peninsula or, what amounts to the same thing, that we should not seek the causes of feudalism in the exterior, but within societies. Don Claudio's theories in this respect are illustrated in such works as *La caballería visigoda* (1930), *El "stipendium" hispanogodo y los orígenes del beneficio prefeudal* (1947), *El ejército visigodo*, etc.

Though by training Don Claudio was, above all, the historian of institutions, economic life in the Asturia-León kingdom also occupies an important place in his work after the publication in 1928 of the study *La primitiva organización monetaria de León y Castilla*, which was followed by *El precio de la vida en el reino asturleonés hace mil años* (1944) and *Moneda de cambio y moneda de cuenta en el reino asturleonés* (1960). Such works as *Notas para el estudio del "petitum"*, *¿Inflación en León y Castilla al filo de 1200?*, *Alfonso el Sabio y la economía dirigida*, etc. are still recommended reading for all those interested in learning more about the economy of León and Castile in the Late Middle Ages.

Although the cities enjoyed little importance during the period studied by Don Claudio, he nevertheless devoted one of his earliest and best works to this subject. In *Estampas de la vida en León hace mil años*, published in 1926, the author reconstructs life in León: the city and its monuments, society, the economy, religion and culture, the institutions, prices, events, surviving traces of Roman and Visigoth culture, the Jewish presence, Islamic influences.... All this, in a literary language that makes a difficult book one capable of keeping the attention even of non-specialist readers. The city is once more the subject of *El gobierno de las ciudades de España del siglo X al X* (1959).

Sánchez-Albornoz's studies of political history are so numerous that we can mention only the most important here. He studied the fall of the Visigoth monarchy in *Otra vez Guadalete y Covadonga* (1944) and *Itinerario de la conquista de España por los musulmanes* (1948); he also produced a lengthy volume on *La España cristiana de los siglos VIII al XI* (1980)... whilst he also analyses the singular nature of Castile in *Alfonso III y el particularismo castellano* (1950), as well as turning his attention to the history of Navarre in such articles as *Los vascos y los árabes en los dos primeros siglos de la Reconquista* (1952)... whose conclusions are found in one of Don Claudio's last works: *Orígenes del reino de Pamplona. Su vinculación con el Valle del Ebro* (1981).

In his search to understand institutions in the Late Middle Ages, Sánchez-Albornoz goes back to Roman times in his studies, not only in the above-mentioned article on the decline of the Roman city, but also in *El culto al emperador y la unificación de España* (1946), *Panorama general de la romanización de Hispania* (1956),

Pervivencia y crisis de la tradición jurídica romana en la España goda (1962).... Written by a leading expert on Visigoth Spain, his studies of *El Aula regia y las asambleas políticas de los godos*, *El Senatus visigodo*, *Don Rodrigo; rey legítimo de España* (1946), etc., are of particular interest.

Though not an Arabist, Don Claudio published thousands of pages on the history of Moorish Spain, as well as promoting the translation and dissemination of works by Muslim authors in «Cuadernos de Historia de España», which he himself established in Buenos Aires. Outstanding amongst Sánchez-Albornoz's own works on the subject are the collection of texts brought together under the title *La España musulmana: Según los autores islamitas y cristianos medievales* (1946) and his overall visions *España y el Islam* (1929), *El Islam de España y el Occidente* (1965), divided into three parts, in which he studies the influence of Islamic Spain on the West, the importance of Roman and Visigoth culture Hispanic Islamists and the cultural projection of the Orient in the west through peninsular Islam.

Don Claudio also cultivated historical geography, which provides the support for much of his research. His fundamentally geographical studies include *Vías romanas del valle del Duero y Castilla la Nueva* (1917), *Vías romanas de Briviesca a Pamplona y de Briviesca a Zaragoza* (1918), *Una vía romana de Asturias: La vía de La Mesa y de Lutos* (1935) and the above-mentioned article on the route followed by the Moorish conquest.

The scientific formulation behind so many important works would not have been possible without detailed study of the sources used, and to this task Sánchez-Albornoz devotes a considerable proportion of each of his articles and monographs, as well as his specific works on Muslim chronicles or Christian historiography of the 8th-13th centuries; and no less important are his studies devoted to criticism and publication of Mediaeval diplomas, which appear in all his works.

Sánchez-Albornoz does not merely study his subjects: his historical curiosity leads him to analyse origins and consequences, and in many cases his marginal studies of both have given place to new interpretations. His interest in the history of the institutions in the Asturia-León kingdom («the history of the condition of men before the evolution, more abstract and disincarnate, of legal forms and categories», according to Charles Verlinden) leads him to research, so that he become an undisputed and controversial master of studies concerning the Visigoth and even Roman periods. It makes him (though not an Arabist) a leading expert on the history of Muslim Spain. It obliges him to delve into the complex world of European feudalism. And it lays the bases for one of the most enthralling overall visions ever written on the history of Spain. I refer, of course, to *España un enigma histórico*, a work I shall return to later.

The extraordinary erudition that Sánchez-Albornoz displays throughout his work sometimes makes it difficult reading. His footnotes do not merely serve to support the text, but are often instilled with a life of their own, and if, on the one hand, they back up or reinforce the affirmations they allude to, on the other they also open up new perspectives, pose fresh problems, and resolve old enigmas, and it is always necessary to read them carefully to capture in all their intensity the author's thought and concerns. On many occasions, Don Claudio's articles form the development of a possibility he has glimpsed and outlined in previous works and, in turn, open up possibilities for new extensions and questions that oblige him to return to his subject until he has completely cleared up his doubts and explained

them to us. A superficial glance would seem to indicate that Sánchez-Albornoz's work continuously returns upon itself and is constantly repeated, but an attentive reading of the entire oeuvre enables us to discern the progress made and to understand the enormous difficulties the historian has had to overcome in order to establish each of his affirmations, basing his subsequent steps on them; although coincidences and viewpoints expressed on other occasions can be found in all his articles, none is superfluous.

Amongst the many difficulties Sánchez-Albornoz had to overcome in order to carry out his Herculean task, not least was that of resisting the temptation of easiness. For a person like Don Claudio, who affirms, «proudly», that not even his first article on the middle ages (dating back to 1914) has been superseded and who declares that only he could rewrite and update his earlier works, it must have been very hard to resist publishing the *Instituciones*. Any other person in the same situation would have rushed the results of their research into print, but Sánchez-Albornoz felt that the work (despite the prizes and the praise, and though he was convinced that only he could improve it) was not finished, and he spent 50 years clearing up his doubts, resolving the marginal problems posed to him, as well as those thrown up by each question he studied... and all this, thousands of kilometres from the archives, practically without material means, his contacts with the literature kept up only thanks to what he was sent by friends, followers and occasional collaborators.

Spanish historians such as myself are not only indebted to Don Claudio for his own contributions, but also owe the fact that we have been able to research and publish our findings to him. He it was who put an end to the hermetic closure of many archives between 1918 and 1922, and who established two of the most important Spanish historical journals: the *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español* and *Cuadernos de Historia de España*. He was responsible, too, for the creation in 1932 of the Instituto de Estudios Medievales as part of the Centro de Estudios Históricos in Madrid, and if circumstances had permitted him to carry out his plans, there is no doubt that we would today possess documentary collections comparable to the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.

Undisputed and controversial master

With regard to the controversial side to his writing, Don Claudio affirmed that «If I believed in destiny [which he did] I would think that I had been born marked by the fates to return to the truth contained by old theories as opposed to the senseless extremes of new ones. To this end have I devoted much time to rejecting no few foolish theses cheerfully aired by the unhealthy inclination of men of these times to amaze their contemporaries with the strangest novelties».

Many are the «strange novelties» that Don Claudio was forced to refute and many more those he disdainfully ignored as he believed that talking about someone was a way of granting them importance, recognising their worth: «Despite my criticisms, however, I never failed to honour certain scholars with whom I crossed swords... As I once said... when I argue with someone, I recognise their scientific status. I would never take up the pen to contradict someone I did not feel was worthy in the confrontation», he wrote in his prologue to *Estudios Polémicos*, a work containing a tiny fraction of his controversies, selected according to the «variety of

subject and authors contradicted, and their relative brevity», for to include all his refutations would have required the republication of Don Claudio's complete works.

Sánchez-Albornoz considered himself and behaved as a knight errant who neither could nor would consent to criticisms of his lady's beauty or virtue: «I cannot remain silent when I come across a historical error, much less when this error contrasts with a truth I have discovered and defended or consider well-grounded.... I have devoted my life to honour and dignity....» A knight, then, who confessed himself «un refined, and it is well-known, too, that I am neither shy nor retiring». In his last years, Don Claudio feared that his polemics would earn him fame throughout posterity as a perennial malcontent, who enjoyed attacking, incapable of recognising the merits of others. Nothing further from the truth, however: «I have always been quick to help those who came to me, no matter who and no matter what efforts were required to satisfy the requests of those who approached me in scientific terms». This is confirmed by those who came to him, amongst them myself, though his criticisms were none the less acerbic, launched against such masters as Menéndez Pidal or against «young professors» (less harshly) such as Estepa, Mínguez and Valdeón, not forgetting fellow scholars or teachers (Galo Sánchez, Ramos Loscertales, Floriano, Paulo Merea...), followers and their pupils (García Gallo, Ubieto...), established foreign masters (Brunner, Barrau-Dihigo, Mayer, Dahn, Dozy...), historians from earlier periods (Pérez Puyol, Gayangos, Saavedra...), not to mention Fray Justo Pérez de Urbel, Álvaro d'Ors, María Rosa Lida, Lecoy, Marcelo Vigil and Abilio Barbero, whom Don Claudio called on to consider his criticisms as a «slap on the back from the old knight errant at the investiture giving the young knight the right to bear arms».

Though at times he was forced to oppose his masters professionally and to expound theories contrary to those he had learnt at university or read in his teachers' books, Sánchez-Albornoz was a grateful pupil who remembered the good teachers with affection and charitably forgets the bad. His historical and educational articles contain references to such masters as Hinojosa, Mélida, Menéndez Pidal, Asín, Madariaga, Ortega... from all of whom he confesses he has learnt. Though strictly speaking he may not have been, he proclaims himself their follower. In his gratitude, this Mediaevalist, specialising in the history of Spain, does not forget that his work was made possible thanks to assistance and encouragement received in America and to American history, and part of his production is also devoted to this history of Hispano-America.

His respect for the masters was echoed in the respect of his pupils, direct and indirect, who participated actively in the tributes rendered to Don Claudio on the occasion of his 70th birthday, when he also celebrated nearly 50 years in teaching, on his 90th birthday, and on the occasion of his death. Those who attended his classes stress particularly the profundity of the information he imparted, the novel methods he used, his enjoyable presentations and the interest he stimulated in his pupils. I myself had the chance to hear him at a congress in Nice in 1970, and can confirm that, despite the arid nature of the subject selected and the huge number of documents used, his lecture was one of the most enjoyable I have ever attended.

History and freedom

Sánchez-Albornoz was not a historical theorist in the sense the term is usually used. Rather he was a historian by trade who often questioned the meaning of his

work and the science he cultivated, wondering whether chance, providence or «rigid economic patterns» guide men and peoples. In short, whether people and communities have been free to choose their path and (as man-historian-politician of the present interested in the future) whether they are now or will be tomorrow. For Don Claudio's great subject is freedom: «if I had been made to choose a thought as my life's motto, I should have chosen Saint Paul's phrase «ubi spiritus Domini ibi libertas». His lecture on being made a member of the Academia Nazionale, moreover, was on History and Freedom.

A liberal both in politics and by personal conviction, Don Claudio bases his work on a certain eclecticism that keeps him from taking up extreme positions, leading him to seek conciliatory formulas, and to distrust equally both great syntheses built on unreliable data and the accumulation of data without a uniting idea. He grants that geography is important as a historical factor, but refuses to accept geographical determinism; he proclaims the need to study economic problems and spiritual factors together; he demands identical attention for both individuals and masses; and he affirms the value of linguistic and literary contributions, as long as these are placed within the social and political framework that made them possible; separated from their context, they are without historical value. In other words, the historian needs to give his or her affirmations a base, contextualise facts in their geographical and historical framework and take an interest in all the manifestations of human life, whether material or spiritual, whether the work of isolated individuals or of the masses. In short, history is the life of man in all its manifestations, and the historian must view it as such. Sánchez-Albornoz defines this vision of history in two types of factor, which he sums up as «life» and «culture». For the former, he understands «human reactions (spiritual, emotional and instinctive) before the problems... that life suggests to man». By the latter, he means «the mass of ideas and values, concepts and technologies, systems and goods created by man». The historian's work, then, is to see and explain how vital and cultural factors mutually interfere with and influence each other constantly throughout time.

Showing little familiarity with Marxist theory, he attributes it with the idea that human life is reduced to «pure economic drives» or that human communities have been «governed by strictly material needs», and Don Claudio cannot understand how «highly intelligent historians that do not like to live in Marxist countries and that, therefore, can discourse freely about the meaning of history, expressing themselves freely» can entertain such a theory. He even devoted a few pages to testing, a physician or a chemist confronted by a working hypothesis, whether history confirms this theory, rejects it or can accept it with a modification or two. The conclusion is obvious: «my analyses and tests have convinced me that the Marxist interpretation of history lacks rigour». Pierre Vilar perhaps goes too far in his homage to Sánchez-Albornoz by stating that «some historians are more Marxist than they think and others less than they think», but many would agree with Don Claudio in his affirmation that «history has really been an on-going civil war of man against himself, that is to say, men against men. Some men against other men, to rule them and live off their work; to force them to worship their gods and think like them; due to expansionist impetus accumulated over the centuries... to prevent the national community from becoming subjugated and to continue living free or to become free once more; to attain freedom from tyrants; to improve their conditions in struggle with more fortunate groups...»

In the age-old struggle between objectivists and subjectivists, Don Claudio inclines towards the former, though recognising that the information the historian deals with is tinted by a two-fold subjectivism: that of those who transmitted it and that of the historian's personality, which tends to become projected over the object of study. The historian's first task is to eliminate subjectivism, using reason and knowledge of human nature. When the «data» is viewed objectively (subject to criticism) it ceases to be mere physical information, acquiring a meaning the historian must interpret, and to this end technique, experience and culture alone are not enough; this historian also needs «a certain mysterious, perhaps inborn core, a particular mental constitution, a noble passion for truth». In these words, Sánchez-Albornoz refuses to reduce the historical to the level of any other science and the historian to that of a scientist with a peculiar field of work; science, technology, do not in themselves constitute history; history is also an art and, in a way, a priestly vocation. This idea is clearly expressed in the comparison he draws between theology and history: «behind the desire of Theology, which attempts to study God, is the desire of History, which rises above other sciences attempting to discover the secrets of nature». For Don Claudio, history (human evolution) tends towards human liberty and the rationalisation through which man «resembles the only truly free being, unstained by irrationality: God».

Passing from the theory of history to the historian's work, Sánchez-Albornoz describes a process that is, in reality, the perfect image of what he himself does: the historian must scientifically relate and rationally master known facts, to which end he or she must answer a thousand questions. Only once he knows the answer to all the questions that arise in his attempt to understand is he ready to «do» history. In practice, according to this process, the historian's work covers three stages: 1) studying and scientifically editing sources; 2) drafting monographs resolving questions arising; and 3) elevating great historical constructions over these sources and monographs from them. This, as we have made clear in our discussion of his activity as a researcher and as he himself notes in such works as *El sentido de la historia*, *El juego de fuerzas en la historia*, *Historia y Libertad* or the first chapter in *España un enigma histórico*, significantly entitled 'El hombre y la historia' (Man and History), analysed by his follower Rosa Zuluaga in *Cuadernos de Historia de España* (1960), is the model and the way Sánchez-Albornoz took as his own.

The enigma of Spanish history

A man who throughout his life maintained a firm attitude towards what he considered his duty as a Spaniard could not allow the writings of other historians whose theories did not merely contradict Don Claudio's, but negated his life, his way of being, to go unanswered. Pierre Vilar understood perfectly this symbiosis between Sánchez-Albornoz's life and work, between the attitude to life he believed a Spaniard should adopt and his own polemical attitude, when he writes: «We should not recognise you, dear Don Claudio, if you were more prudent or less proud than a Spaniard should be», and Don Claudio well knew what a Spaniard should be, for he devoted thousands of hours and thousands of pages to describing his ideas about the Spanish character, to analysing in *España: Un enigma histórico* Américo Castro's ideas about the historical reality of Spain.

For Castro, Spain is the result of the action of three forces, represented by the Jews, the Muslims and the Christians, and its birth should, therefore, be dated in the year 711. Spain acquired the peculiar characteristics that differentiate and isolate it from Europe, and that eventually led the country into backwardness and failure in 1492: the Spanish people, dominated by religious concerns, are without aptitude for science or technology, and their character, strongly marked by Jewish and Islamic traits, remains unchanged throughout history. Sánchez-Albornoz reacted against these ideas for a three-fold reason: as a historian, interested not only in the mentality but also the overall life of human groups, he cannot accept conclusions based principally on literary texts and in which neither the institutions nor the economy have been taken into account; as a Mediaevalist whose works defend the decisive importance of the Reconquest in forming the Spanish character, he cannot accept that this should be minimised in favour of Judaic and Muslim influence; and, moreover, conceiving history as change, as the march towards freedom and rationalisation, he cannot accept the idea that the Spanish character was completely formed in 1492; to accept it would be to accept a suicidal determinism that affects not only Spanish Mediaeval history but which can also condition Spain's present and future history. For these reasons (roughly outlined here) Sánchez-Albornoz openly opposed Américo Castro's theories, combating them in numerous articles that finally result in *España: Un enigma histórico* and the articles collected in 1973 under the title of *El drama de la formación de España y los españoles: Otra nueva aventura polémica*.

If a people's character is forged in its history, then we need to know this in all its amplitude, and if this people is the Spanish people, then it will be necessary to explain how Spain was formed, not forgetting that the historian's conclusions will depend on his point of view. This, then, is why Don Claudio devoted a section to describing his opinion of *El juego de fuerzas en la Historia*. Sánchez-Albornoz was convinced that each people gradually created a lifestyle in prehistoric times, forming the fundamental characteristics temperamental that, «although at times enduring for centuries, are not everlasting or constant and can by no means be considered invariable and indelible», but which, in any case, influence the heroes (or, in their absence, the governing minorities) who with chance and lifestyle «have made and remade history».

This approach explains the structure of Don Claudio's work: after the methodological-explanatory chapter, Sánchez-Albornoz analyses the influence of the geographical environment on the formation of certain characteristics in the Spanish temperament before, in the following chapters, discussing, through detailed historical study, the temperamental traits, the role of heroes (those for whom the word «heroes» has military connotations may prefer the word geniuses) such as the Archpriest of Hita, the behaviour of the governing minorities in society.... Finally, in the three last of the eighteen chapters in the work, he analyses Spain as a historical unit, the failure or short-circuiting of Spanish Modernity and the differences between Spain and the rest of Europe.

References to the Spanish character are a constant throughout the nearly 1,500 pages of *España*; even before the year 800, the Spanish, passionate more than calculating or reasoning, fight for their freedom, regardless of whether their enemy is Rome, the Visigoths or Islam; they are sober, hardy and generous, moved more by faith in one man than by defending an idea, but when they accept this idea they

fight passionately to impose it, accepting no dissidence in their exaltation; they are willing to die for their leaders or their ideas, but reject the idea of constant sacrifice; they are loyal and faithful, little given to solidarity or union, and proud; they care little for continuous work, and less for technology, for processing the products they obtain from the land.... Virtues and defects, temperamental traits, in short, which are found in Martial, the first real Spaniard, according to Don Claudio.

We could follow Sánchez-Albornoz's vision of the evolution and permanence of life style, the vital contexture, the temperamental characteristics of the Spanish in time, but neither time nor space permits and I hope, in any case, that these lines will encourage the reader to become familiar with Don Claudio's work at first hand, outlining his thought and the intention that led him to write, that of: «offering the Spanish an image of their yesterday and, thereby, hope for their tomorrow» for, contrary to what Américo Castro and his followers maintain, the historian's task is «not to question the capacity of the Spanish to do what the most intelligent peoples on earth have done and do. And, forgetting all our alleged creational frustrations, to apply all the human potential in us to renew Spanish life». Faced by their history, the Spanish must defend and amend it. This is exactly what Martial did, becoming the first in a long list of Spaniards whose last representative to date is Don Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz y Menduiña, at once liberal and anti-communist conservative, catholic and republican; a politician Azaña accused of cowardice for not returning to Spain when war broke out but who, denying his Hispanic temperament (capable of the greatest momentary heroism and useless for continued efforts) had the immense courage to remain in exile until the death of Franco; a politician admired by the left whilst he remained in Buenos Aires and appropriated by the right when he returned to Spain; a Mediaevalist recognised by all as a master but who has been forced to polemicise with almost all; a Hispanic drawn between the permanence of the Spanish character and its gradual transformation; a Castilian who aims to speak of Spain, of all the Spanish, and who gives particular importance to Castile, whose political role he summed up in parliament in 1931: "I changed Ortega's unfair phrase Castile made Spain and Castile unmade it, coining another, absolutely exact: Castile made Spain and Spain unmade Castile".

The historian politician

This reference to Don Claudio's 1931 parliamentary address is not fortuitous, for Sánchez-Albornoz did not renounce his position as historian even when he acted as the spokesman for Azaña's party, Republican Action. He is perhaps thinking of this and other speeches in which politics and history are mixed when Don Claudio speaks of historians' tendency to intervene in politics and that of politicians to rewrite or manipulate history in a newspaper article included in his *Ensayos sobre Historia de España*.¹ In it, he points out the mutual attraction that exists between politics and history and describes the failure that generally accompanies those who dare to change field: «When the politician, instead of reading and meditating on the teachings of the past, allows himself to be drawn by the desire to write History, he fails through vulgarity... He goes to History with his spirit full of apriorisms and...

¹ (Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1973), pp. 142-148, entitled 'El historiador y el político'.

seeks in [the past] proof of his theories, his preferences and his partisan passions...» No better is the historian who «goes down into the bustle of the world's ring, becoming a curious spectator to the sometimes tragic game of public life... He is used to boxing shadows, which know how to wait, which do not attack, which give one time to think, which allow one to observe. Suddenly, he is faced by the bull of everyday political problems, which charges furiously at him, giving him no time for analysis... And he is frequently caught on the horns of urgency. Accustomed to scientific doubt, to slow, painstaking study, to mature reflection, to the slow analysis of historical phenomena, he finds it difficult to act in public life, when one must make choices at every hour... And when, repentant, he returns to more pleasurable dealings with shadows, he still feels, on occasion, shaken by memories of his battles with the horned beast of actuality from his time as a politician and at times believes he sees today's image in the past».

This explains why «most deformations of History are the work of public men become historians» (who are responsible for mistaken theories and errors that circulate about feudalism, municipal liberties, union organisation, the parliamentary regime, the special powers or *fueros* some communities enjoy, the Inquisition, the war among communities, the expulsion of the Jews...). By way of example, Alfonso X may well be the prototype of the historian turned politician who, as such, «ruined the work of his father, Fernando III. Indecisive, slow in his resolutions, analytical, weak-willed, vain, he allowed himself to be seduced by the adventure of his ambition of empire, was unable to prevent civil war with his son, Sancho, died alone and abandoned by his people» and was, in short, another historian-politician who «suffered persecution and bitterness».

Despite these experiences, a balance is possible and, although he does not himself say so, Sánchez-Albornoz is a good example of the historian turned politician and the politician who uses history, according to the formula he provides in the same article: «The historian who, rather than closing himself in his ivory tower and limiting himself to pleasurable but misleading dealings with shadows, dares take, fearful and cautious, the path of politics, will gain in sharpness of vision, in human exigency and richness of perspectives. Learning about the things and people of his day, he will be better prepared to study and judge the people and things of yesterday. And history is nothing, in the final outcome, but a great aerial arc that, through the instantaneous, ephemeral present, leaps from the remote past to mysterious tomorrow, the politician will also learn from reading and studying History... If only historians knew political life from the inside... and if public men would only think about History!»

True to his own formula, Don Claudio was both a valued historian and teacher of historians and a public man who represented Ávila province as a deputy in the three legislatures during the Second Spanish Republic, becoming vice-president of parliament, minister for foreign affairs on two occasions, Spanish ambassador in Lisbon and, finally, between 1962 and 1970, head of the Spanish government in exile. Nonetheless, it should be said that during this final period Don Claudio was totally disgusted with politics, accepting the post only to prevent it being taken up by Dolores Ibarruri, the personification of the Marxism that he so often thundered against in his historical work, which began many years before he entered politics and continued when it had ceased to interest him, though politics and politicians would accompany him even to the tomb in the atrium of Ávila Cathedral. His funer-

al was attended by all the politicians of the moment in homage to one who, amongst many other interventions, defended the view of Republican Action, the party led by Manuel Azaña, on the draft Constitution for the Second Republic and on Agrarian Reform, on both occasions demonstrating his knowledge of Spain's Mediaeval past and, particularly, of feudal estates the 1932 Agrarian Reform Act sought to abolish.

To explain Sánchez-Albornoz's presence in parliament, we must go back to his family history. When he stood as a republican deputy in 1931, he inherited the voters of his monarchist father, who justified the change as follows: «Your time has come. You chose not to follow the same path as me. You are going to end and continue my tradition. End it, because I shall always be a monarchist. And continue it, because I shall always be a liberal, and because I trust that you will not forget my example of disinterestedness and generosity. Serve Freedom and the Republic with enthusiasm, but always remember that above both is Spain». That Don Claudio took these recommendations fully to heart was illustrated in parliament on 22 October 1931 when, speaking in favour of an amendment to Article 48 of the draft Constitution, making «the study of Spanish compulsory at all primary and secondary education establishments in Spain», he began his speech by declaring that the amendment did not respond exactly to the thinking of those lodging it, but «we have all accepted the text of the same with our gaze placed on the future of the Republic and of Spain; we have each given way, we have descended from our ideal positions because, my honourable colleagues, this is something transcendental for the life of Spain».

If the paternal legacy led him into politics and his agreement with Azaña into Republican Action, it was thanks to his knowledge of Spanish history that he became spokesman for this party over such decisive issues as the draft Constitution or the Agrarian Reform Bill (Sánchez-Albornoz gave the first indications of this knowledge in his article *La potestad real y los señoríos en Asturias, León y Castilla durante los siglos VIII al XIII*, published in 1914, when he was 21 years old). In his disquisition on both subjects, Don Claudio, who was anything but modest and humble, begins by mentioning the error his party commits in commending the defence of its line to someone who is merely «a student of Spain's past, for which reason I must be concerned, above all, with those problems in which history plays a decisive role» (Constitución) or «I plan to bring to the debate what we might call experience of Spanish agrarian history. Instead of spending my days studying historical anecdotes of kings and princes, magnates and courtiers, wars and affairs of the palace alcove, I have devoted myself to study the history of the Spanish people and Spanish agriculture: I come, therefore, with the desire to contribute this experience of mine to this debate... because the Agrarian Reform problem exceeds the limits, the frame of the questions of the moment, to enter fully into historical perspective. It may not, therefore, be inappropriate also to hear the voice here of a modest student of the past».

It is with this baggage and with these aims, then, that Don Claudio took the stand to detail his party's position, which favoured a Constitution that socialised but respected the world's legal tradition... autonomist, but without damage to national unity... a Constitution that maintains the balance between reality and the ideal or, in a historian's words, one that seeks to maintain the balance between the past and the future, those two forces that eternally clash in time and in space. Though he does not agree in everything with the socialists («if we agreed... we should not

be on these benches, but on those»), Republican Action applauds the socialisation reflected in the constitutional draft and with Republican Action its spokesman, who expressly declares his faith in socialism: «Personally, I should like to make clear that a historian, a history teacher, can adopt no other posture; that one who has seen in documents and chronicles the steady transformations in peoples' social and economic organisation; who has seen the serf become a tenant farmer, the tenant farmer a villein, the villein a freeman; who has seen the triumph of the cities of the kings; who has contemplated the evolution of property over the centuries; who has seen the firmest-seeming political and governing systems collapse; one who, in short, is convinced that Humanity has never stopped on its path towards freedom and towards equality amongst men, could not fail also to be convinced that the near future must belong to the socialist party, that the future is yours... and ours, because, in the final outcome, you work for the well-being of Humanity.»

The Constitution's «autonomism» once more allows the orator to give free rein to his historical knowledge, converting the parliamentary chamber into a lecture hall on the History of Spain, history of unity and diversity, which must be taken into account in order to correct the grave errors committed since the time of the Catholic Monarchs. These merely joined their realms; they did not attempt to create coordinating organs between them. There was amongst the Peninsular kingdoms... no other bond than shared royalty, a joint international policy and a solid religious unity. The House of Austria encountered this Mediaeval system and maintained it... As for the Bourbons... they created a French-style State... in line with their need for absolute power, and the lack of coordinating bodies between the different kingdoms was the cause of Spain's decadence because – Don Claudio was a Castilian nationalist² – some of the kingdoms under the Spanish Crown did not unite their forces to the common cause, and Castile could not bear alone the weighty load of the Spanish Empire, which fell to the ground, broken into a thousand pieces, in the sad days of King Charles the Mad.

Sánchez-Albornoz, who had, in 1919, given a lecture at the University of Valladolid entitled *Vindicación histórica de Castilla* (Historical vindication of Castile) called on parliament to be fair to Castile, not to accuse it of exploiting the kingdom when it had merely been the victim of the Spanish Empire: «Castile the exploiter, when in the final outcome it was made a scapegoat by all! Everyone knows that Castile was an emporium of wealth at the beginning of the Modern Age: all the cities of Castile were populated by textile mills... important guilds, wealthy guilds, that built churches and chapels; fairs took place at Medina del Campo... the Consulates of Castile were famous overseas.... Nonetheless, as Castile was forced to bear the burden of the Spanish Empire alone, those hands were one day left without work, the workshops closed one by one, the fairs were discontinued, the consulates were closed overseas and those hands, that had worked wood or silver, were stretched out to beg for alms or a job. Mr Ortega Gasset says, in that admirable book entitled *España invertebrada*, that Castile made Spain and Castile unmade it. I would ask him to substitute that phrase for another: Castile made Spain and Spain unmade Castile».

² The text of the Valladolid speech was published by the University of Valladolid in 1974 in a small volume entitled *Mis tres primeros estudios históricos* (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1974).

The Constitution remedies these errors by recognising that Spain has always been one and multiple, whether both those that seek to create the unitary or centralist Spain and those that deny the supreme unity of Spain like it or not. United and Diversity can be traced throughout History, and Don Claudio did not miss the chance to do so in a speech that his political leader, Manuel Azaña, later proclaimed «Discreet, somewhat hurried, touches of historical erudition, Castilian nationalism...» After the Muslim invasion, the Mediaevalist reminded his audience, that Roman and Visigoth unity had been broken, and it was then that the differential fact of Catalonia emerged; it was then that the differential fact of the Basque Country became accentuated, for the Basque Country has always been, as it is now, a bastion of Spanish tradition. Those now known as Basques were once the Spaniards who refused to accept Latin language and culture, in the same way as they today refuse to accept the Spanish people's thought and political forms... the Basque Country has conserved a marvellous relic, for which philologists should thank them; but, in the end, the Basque Country is nothing more than part of that old Spain that has passed on to Spain those marks of inflexibility, those marks of statism that have endured through the centuries in our country, in which Galicia also presents certain differential circumstances, though, transcending any difference, Spain is joined by a multiple unity: ethnic unity, geographic unity, cultural unity, unity of temperament, unity of destinies, and the Republic should respect both unity and diversity, and must be particularly sensitive to differences because, according to Don Claudio, whilst the Monarchy, absolutism and centralism have got along together marvellously in History, republican regimes, which respect individual freedom, also respect the freedom of natural or political groupings of citizens and, therefore, so-called regional groupings, to which we shall grant autonomy, always bearing in mind the teachings of History, the parallels that can be drawn between the ancient and Mediaeval world and the 20th century.

In the Middle Ages, the imbalance between economic life under the Roman Empire and the statist base of the city spelled disaster for the Empire, and if Europe did not successfully find a super-state formula, over and above the nation, the base of organisation in the 20th century, western civilisation would fall back into the chaos of the Middle Ages, as organisation in closed compartments (nations) is more of a hindrance than a help for the continental economy, which finds in the borders of these closed compartments, prickling with huge customs barriers, the greatest obstacles to its development.

The solution lies in adjusting political organisation to the economy, in converting Europe into a political unity as befits a continental economy, and it is to this end that History works, though for the moment the historian-turned-politician cannot be sure whether the new step can be done, will it be done within decades or will another thousand years be needed, as in the Middle Ages, for us to form a continental super-State? Spain should work towards the creation of this new political unity, because to work for Europe is to implement a continuist policy, the 16th-century policy of Spanish catholicism; a policy of universality that would be, at heart, a Castilian policy and a Spanish policy.

Months later, Sánchez-Albornoz was called on to defend and try to improve the Agrarian Reform Bill. His speech is a clear reflection of his knowledge and, also, of the passion for polemic that he reveals in both his historical writing and in his political work. Years later, Don Claudio proudly proclaimed: «Throughout my long life,

I would dare to affirm that I have never been anything but a historian. A historian who has devoted his life to studying Spain's past. Knowledge of this past and love for my country thrust me into public life. Seeing everything change and alter throughout the world over the centuries made me fight once, and continue fighting today, for the orderly transformation of the Spain that gave me birth». These words explain his speech before parliament and the two articles he later devoted to Agrarian Reform to summarise his contribution to the 1932 bill and his opposition to attempts to modify the Reform Bill by the right-wing parties in 1935. This opposition won congratulations, though not without reproach, from a socialist deputy: «A great speech, very different from what we heard from you on the same subject in the Constituent Assembly », to which Don Claudio replied: «In the Constituent Assembly I have the conscientious duty to halt a Chamber with a large left-wing majority, whilst now I judge it to be my duty to push a parliament dominated by the right». In other words, Don Claudio's place was always with the opposition, and paradox one of his mottos, a paradox seen clearly in the definition he gave of himself on many occasions as «catholic, liberal, democrat and republican», terms compatible now but irreconcilable in the 1930s.

The presence of a Mediaevalist in a parliamentary debate on the Agrarian Reform Bill is explained because several parts of the bill make explicit mention of feudal estates. For example, Part 5, Section 6 declares liable for expropriation for subsequent distribution amongst the peasantry those lands that «constitute jurisdictional feudal estates and which have been passed down to the present owners by inheritance, legacy or gift. Also those feudal estates transferred by the seller at their own expense, or in those in which the assignor has stipulated that there would be no obligation of eviction or rehabilitation as he disposed of the property under the same conditions as he had owned them»...

Though Don Claudio's views were not always accepted, these and other provisions to a certain extent reflect the contributions of this Mediaevalist and spokesman for Republican Action. We can attribute to him, too, the merit of contributing to the conservation of many Mediaeval documents presented as evidence of the feudal nature of lands by peasants and councils under the terms of the Agrarian Reform Act. These are now held in the former IRYDA archives for consultation by Mediaevalists, modern historians and those interested in the Property Register of the Marquis of La Ensenada, often presented as proof of the existence or absence of feudal estates and rights.³

In the speech he delivered on 27 August 1931, Don Claudio emphasises that this is not the first time agrarian reform has been carried out, defining the History of Spain as «an uninterrupted series of agrarian reforms» whose teachings lead the historian to remember that political change, the advent of the Republic, serve nothing if an agrarian reform, transforming Spain's very essence, is not carried out. This agrarian reform, «bringing human reserves to Spain that have until now been isolated from cultural life in miserable villages all over the Peninsula, giving the Republic rural sustenance and bringing new currents of young blood, unused in

³ An initial approximation to the subject can be seen in an article written in cooperation with Amanda Cabo, María Pía Senent and Dolores Moreno de Vega, 'La abolición de los derechos y prestaciones señoriales: La Ley de Reforma Agraria y su interés para la Historia Mediaeval y Moderna', *«Espacio, Tiempo y Forma», Historia Medieval*, 5 (1992), 303-316.

civilization's struggle, to the river of Hispanic life,» should «produce what I call the fecundity of the Republic».

After studying the general outline of the bill and manifesting his agreement with it in declarations surprising today and more so in 1932, coming from one who declares himself not a socialist and is accused of the same (I would dare... to affirm... that property will be a historical memory in a few centuries serfdom and like many old institutions that once existed, when they appeared eternal and immutable, but which have ceased to be so due to the force of events, due to the force of human reason), he approved the map, the geographical distribution of the Agrarian Reform, which will be applied, according to Part 2, «in the municipal regions of Andalusia, Extremadura, Ciudad Real, Toledo, Albacete and Salamanca» following the line that, with evident exaggeration, coincides, according to Don Claudio «with the area of application of the two colonisation systems used in the repopulation of Spain: freemen, smallholdings, to the north of the line; large estates, military orders, nobility, south of the Tagus to the Mediterranean». Today's politicians have not respected this dividing line, and the PER and attempts to implement the agrarian reform frustrated by the 1936-39 civil war exist only in Extremadura and Andalusia.

The reform was applied in these provinces and extended throughout national territory in the case of lands «that constituted former feudal estates», a measure Sánchez-Albornoz applauded since, as he pointed out: «in many villages in Castile and the rest of Spain we were living in the Middle Ages. Things had not changed in a thousand years. Life in these villages was like a nightmare, still subject to a lord. Nothing in them belonged to the villagers, not even their own homes. As he had a thousand years before, the lord appointed judges, mayors, constables. When parliamentary elections came around, the lord told the tenant farmers who to vote for and, since what the lord said went, the whole electoral role voted for candidates in the same party as the lord, or whoever he favoured». This was a practice Don Claudio's own family used, transferring voters and seat from father to son, even though one was a monarchist and the other a republican.

It is right that estates owned by the nobility should be expropriated and redistributed, and it is just that the reform should be extended to goods that once belonged to nobles and are now in the hands of people who do not form part of the nobility, because the republic must be more interested in freeing tenant farmers than in expropriating from the nobles, and many villages are «subject to a gentleman who is not the grandson of the old lords, but in reality continues to exercise power, public power, in these feudal villages», a situation the Republic cannot consent to, just as it must not and cannot tolerate, if it really wants to carry out reform worthy of the name, the exclusion from the Reform of large estates, whether owned by the nobility or not, lands that «form two thirds, two fifths or half... of a village and are still in the hands of a single family» that, merely because they control most of the land, wield real power over peasants in the area, a power little different from that held by the lord.

The bill for the bases of the reform speaks of feudal estates, and everyone talks about them, «even those who knew nothing about Spanish Mediaeval history, moved by the legitimate right to defend their interests, or those of their friends, or those of their partisans», without taking historical reality into account, or distorting it to present the feudal estates according to their own beliefs: «Some... attribute mag-

nificent services to them in the work of colonising Spain. According to these friends of the lords, the monarchs gave the lords the land so that they could farm it. There was a need to plough and fight the war at the same time, and the lords generously protected their tenant farmers, those responsible for ploughing the fields of Spain, whilst they defended the land against the Muslim enemy. A historical picture that does not tell the truth.... For others, the wording feudal estate throws shadows into their minds that begin to form old battlemented castles, gallows and dungeons. They see the lords of these battlemented castles descending, whip in hand, to exercise alleged *droits de seigneur* in the village. Like the other, a false picture».

Distancing himself from both, Sánchez-Albornoz presents the feudal estates in their historical context, as a link in «that chain of historical phenomena and institutions that has gradually affirmed the freedom of men over the centuries», helping to transform the personal serf «who lived like an animal in a stable, without wife, without children, without family... into the Mediaeval villein who worked the land as a tenant farmer, who could form a family and pays the lord part of the fruit of his labour as rent». Although all definitions are difficult, however, Sánchez-Albornoz sticks out his neck to define the feudal estate (I am copying literally here and share his definition) as «a closed geographical unit within which public power has delegated part of its functions to a lord. This lord exercises public powers by delegation from the king, exercises public powers by delegation from the monarch and may or may not be the owner of the land. The king has given him his power, the only thing the king can give him. If he is also the owner by other routes, he joins the status of owner to that of lord. If not, he will be a lord only. Working these noble lands will imply, on the one hand, the payment of taxes and, on the other, taxes and rent...

Over the centuries, it became difficult to distinguish between the public payment (taxes) and private payment (rent) the farmers paid» and the Cadiz Parliament attempted to separate ownership from the status of lord, reclaiming jurisdiction for the Nation and respecting property, a policy that would come into force in 1837, though with many cases of fraud: lords who had never been owners but had only held public power delegated by the prince got around the law and claimed rights over the tenant farmers' lands, «unrightfully seizing houses and properties that the descendants of the first inhabitants of those noble lands had been farming for centuries». The Republic should correct these abuses without falling into the opposite error of unjustly taking over lands the nobles owned: «The Republic has no remedy but to indemnify them if it wishes to work justly» and to work justly it must carry out an investigation to ascertain «the types of property of each owner to be expropriated, to find out by what paths he acquired his inheritance» as, by indemnifying the owners it may be that «the descendants of the money-lender, the profiteer, who acquired his property by repugnant means» is being indemnified whilst any compensation is denied to those who at any time rendered a service that Spain cannot forget; those who received estates for services to Spain, to Castile, to Aragon, to the Fatherland.

In brief, Don Claudio proposes that those estates where «a historic fraud» has been committed should be expropriated «without compensation», and that compensation should be paid, «like any other property, to estates where the lord was also the owner. It is not so difficult to distinguish one from another», though even the greatest expert, Don Claudio, «could wish for any undertaking more arduous

on my poor back than that of declaring in each case... this was only a jurisdictional estate, this other one held both ownership and lordship. If the Republic is to carry out just agrarian reform, it must distinguish what History has distinguished».

Historical experience also helped Don Claudio to resolve the problem of settlements and settled, of the peasant who will be placed on land expropriated with or without compensation. Sánchez-Albornoz proposed, in defence of the peasants, that they should not be converted into owners, that «the money of all the Spanish people» should not be used to pay for land which «may tomorrow be absorbed by the great landowners, may once more, later, go to fill out large estates old and new.» If it were up to him, Don Claudio would make these peasants not owners but «what the old free tenant farmers (who were at the base of Castilian liberties) were» and, as regards the preference the bill establishes amongst day labourers, smallholders and leaseholders, Don Claudio asks that the first to be settled should be «those who work the land» so as not to repeat the tragedy which Mendizábal's disentailment and the suppression of the old estates in 1811-1837 caused for many peasants, as it did not take into account the historic rights of peasants «who, if they had not acquired right of use, had acquired something similar. The lord could not evict them from their lands after centuries, nor increase the rent they had to pay; they could sell their inheritance to people of the same condition, they could transfer them by inheritance and could have use of them even when they were absent from their fields. The centuries had forged a legal link between the labourer and the land he had always worked» and the successive agrarian reforms (disentailment, suppression of estates) did not take this link into account, uprooting the peasants from the fields they had traditionally cultivated, turning them into temporary tenant farmers «that the owner could expel from his fields each year, into tenant farmers whose rents could be increased... into tenant farmers that could be legally evicted from their homes... We cannot repeat this mistake today. Before anyone else, these tenant farmers must be settled on the land they have worked sometimes for hundreds of years. It is, moreover, the least costly solution for the Republic. They have farm tools, they have cattle, they are used to working the land. Let us give it to them; first, them, and later everyone else.» In this, he was completely opposed to the socialists, who gave preference to the labourers and wanted, according to Don Claudio, to turn them into tenant farmers with no real right to the land, killing off any possible initiative to improve the peasants' lot.

Two other aspects of the agrarian reform also concerned Don Claudio: the recovery of communal goods, usurped over the centuries, in Castilian villages that also had the right to «the Republic's caresses» as did the people of Andalusia and Extremadura, who would directly benefit from the reform; and it will not hurt those amongst us who spend their lives arguing as to whether the Mediaeval lord's rents are lordly or territorial to remember with Sánchez-Albornoz that granting land is of little use if the means of cultivating it are not also supplied. During the dictatorship (we should correct Don Claudio and remember that the process began before, in 1907, with the creation of the Central Colonisation and Interior Repopulation Board) land was bought and distributed amongst peasants, who paid just 20 per cent of its value, as Agrarian Social Action advanced the remaining 80 per cent.

Despite these advantageous conditions (not so advantageous, as the price was often artificially inflated to favour the owners) the peasants did not possess the 20 per cent and were forced to become indebted to banks or money-lenders and, once

the euphoria of buying their freedom had passed they found themselves in debt and worse off than when they depended on a lord or, in the words of Sánchez-Albornoz: «Agrarian Social Action gave 80 per cent; the peasants went to a bank or a money-lender to get the remaining 20 per cent and the contract was signed. This was celebrated with great pomp, a mass was said, speeches were made, photographs were taken, rockets were set off into the sky to express the tenant farmers' hopes and desires; but, just as the rocket sticks fell to the ground soon afterwards, so did the peasants' hopes quickly come crashing down... as every year they had to pay a rent much higher than they had paid until then. The bank drafts, the discounts, the interest... still kept them slaves, for they had disadvantageously replaced the lord for a new owner that also appointed local authorities, that appointed judges and imposed the member of parliament, or tried to in recent times».

Don Claudio was aware that the owners would not allow themselves to be stripped of their land easily and tax-payers' money to be used to help the peasants pay off their debts, but reminded the discontents that if agrarian reform had taken place in Russia the Communists would not have taken power there and that if the owners of the land «do not have enough spirit of sacrifice to assist with this reform happily... let them assist with resignation, knowing that it will, at least, prevent them from suffering in their person and their possessions much greater damage than it itself will cause to their wealth....» Sánchez-Albornoz took the peasants' part and, following the example of Mediaeval preachers, asked landowners to understand his position and that of reform supporters through a clearly Mediaeval example: «A Castilian lord's falcons began to eat the hens of a farm labourer who worked some land not far from the lord's castle. Humbly, the man brought his grievance before his noble neighbour. The lord would not listen to his pleas. The labourer asked a priest to intervene on his behalf. The falcons continued to raid the peasant's hen-house. Finally, the peasant could stand no more and killed a falcon. The lord then sent his men to crucify the labourer for his birds of prey to pick to death. Who do you feel most for? I asked the majority. And the majority was about to applaud me, Don Santiago Alba, Speaker of the House confessed to me» in 1935, but the majority rejected the amendments proposed by the Mediaevalist, here following the example set by the socialists in 1932, an attitude that led Sánchez-Albornoz to complain that «party discipline obliges us, at times, to submit to the majority agreement that we judge to be erroneous, clumsy and, at times, absurd».

To escape such compromising situations, he sought an honourable way out, none other than taking up the post of Spanish ambassador to Lisbon, an aspect of his life that far exceeds my purpose of calling attention to the contributions made by that master of Mediaevalists Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz in drafting the Law of Bases for the Agrarian Reform Bill and the rules and regulations that completed that bill, and whose failure signified «the failure of the Republic» and, indirectly, the exile of Don Claudio, a serious historian who entered politics ready to place his historical knowledge at the service of the Republic.⁴

⁴ As Don Claudio's work as a historian is so well-known, I have gone into more detail in analysing his political activities, which are no more than another demonstration of his preparation as a historian, to which I have devoted several previously-published articles and, to mark the centenary of his birth, the work *Don Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz* (Valladolid: 1986).

Chronology

1893. He was born in Madrid.
1913. He obtained his degree in Philosophy and Letters from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
1914. He obtained his PhD, with a laudatory mention.
1916. He published his doctoral thesis, *La Monarquía en Asturias, León y Castilla durante los siglos VIII al XIII. La Potestad Real y los Señoríos*.
1918. He obtained the Chair of History of Spain in the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters of the Universitat de Barcelona. He was only 25 years old. He maintained it until 1933, when he asked for leave of absence in order to devote himself to politics.
1924. He founded the *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español*.
1925. He was appointed numerary Academic of the Real Academia de la Historia. He was the youngest academic to be appointed to date.
1931. His political activity intensified. He was elected member of the Spanish Parliament for Ávila for the three sessions of the Republican Parliament, he was Ministro de Estado, Vice President of the Parliament, Consejero de Instrucción Pública and Spanish Ambassador in Lisbon.
- 1932-1934. Rector of the Universidad Central de Madrid.
1936. The Spanish Civil War forced him to leave Spain, in what would be the beginning of a long exile. He lectured at the Université de Bordeaux from 1937 to June 1940.
1939. A Decree of 29th July finally dispossessed him of his Chair because of his Republican ideas. At the outbreak of the Second World War he had to abandon France and move to Argentina.
1942. In Mendoza, Argentina, he published his great work about the origins of feudalism, *En torno a los orígenes del feudalismo*. He obtained the Chair of Medieval History at the Universidad de Buenos Aires. From here he devoted himself fully to his teaching and researching activity, in what became his most productive period. He founded the Instituto de Historia de España which started publishing the *Cuadernos de Historia de España*. His international prestige grew.
1957. Another of his great works, *España, un enigma histórico*, is published.
- 1959-1970. His political activity does not cease. He was now the President of the Spanish Republican Government in exile.
1976. He revisited Spain in the month of April, but returned to Buenos Aires after two months.
1978. The King and Queen of Spain, Don Juan Carlos and Doña Sofía, travelled to Argentina to distinguish him with the Gran Cruz de Alfonso X el Sabio.
1983. He returned to Spain, and settled in Ávila. He was awarded the Gran Cruz de Carlos III and the Gold Medal of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
1984. He was awarded the Spanish Príncipe de Asturias prize for Communication and the Humanities. He died in Ávila on 8th July. He was buried in the cloister of Ávila cathedral.

Selected bibliography

1. Works

- Estampas de la vida en León hace mil años* (Madrid: Archivos, 1926).
- En torno a los orígenes del feudalismo* (Mendoza: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, 1942).
- Ruina y extinción del municipio romano en España e instituciones que lo reemplazan* (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Historia de la Cultura Española Medieval y Moderna, 1943).
- El Ajbar Maym'a. Problemas historiográficos que suscita* (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Historia de la Cultura Española Medieval y Moderna, 1944).

- Una ciudad hispano-cristiana hace un milenio. Estampas de la vida en León* (Buenos Aires: Nova, 1947).
- El 'Stipendium' hispano-godo y los orígenes del beneficio prefeudal* (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas. Departamento de Historia de España, 1947).
- España, un enigma histórico*, (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1957).
- Estudios sobre las instituciones medievales españolas* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, 1965).
- Despoblación y repoblación en el Valle del Duero*, (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Historia de España, 1966).
- Investigaciones sobre historiografía hispana medieval (siglos VIII al XIII)* (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Historia de España, 1967).
- Investigaciones y documentos sobre las instituciones hispanas* (Santiago de Chile: Editorial Jurídica, 1970).
- Miscelánea de estudios históricos* (León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación 'San Isidoro', CSIC, 1970).
- Estudios visigodos* (Roma, Instituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1971).
- Orígenes de la nación española. Estudios críticos sobre la Historia del reino de Asturias* (Oviedo: Instituto de Estudios Asturianos, 1972-1975).
- Fuentes de la historia hispanomusulmana del siglo VIII*, 3 vols (Buenos Aires: Editorial Universitaria, 1974-1979)
- De mi anecdotario político* (Buenos Aires: Losada, 1972)
- Ensayos sobre Historia de España* (Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1973)
- El Islam de España y el Occidente* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1974)
- Mi testamento histórico político* (Barcelona: Planeta, 1975).
- Anecdotario político* (Barcelona: Planeta, 1976).
- Viejos y nuevos estudios sobre las instituciones medievales españolas* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1976)
- Trayectoria histórica de Vasconia. El destino de Navarra* (Pamplona: Editorial Navarra, 1977).
- El régimen de la tierra en el reino asturleonés hace mil años* (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Historia de España, 1978).
- El reino asturleonés (722-1037). Sociedad, Economía, Gobierno, Cultura y Vida. Historia de España Menéndez Pidal*, t. VII, vol. 1 (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1980).
- Estudios sobre Galicia en la temprana Edad Media* (La Coruña: Fundación Barrié de la Maza, 1981).
- Orígenes del Reino de Pamplona. Su vinculación con el Valle del Ebro* (Pamplona: Institución Príncipe de Viana, 1981).
- Orígenes y destino de Navarra; Trayectoria histórica de Vasconia; otros escritos* (Barcelona: Planeta, 1984).

2. Homages

- Homenaje al Profesor Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz* (Buenos Aires: Universidad, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, 1964).
- Homenaje de Asturias a Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz*, ed. by Eloy Benito Ruano (Oviedo: Caja de Ahorros de Asturias, 1980).
- Estudios en homenaje a Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz a sus noventa años. Anexos a Cuadernos de Historia de España*, 4 vols (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Historia de España, 1983-1986).
- Estudios en memoria del profesor D. Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz*, 2 vols, ed. by Miguel Ángel Ladero (Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1986).

3. Works on Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz

- Hilda Grassotti, *Historia de un historiador. Homenaje al profesor Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz* (Buenos Aires: Universidad, 1964).

José Luis Martín, *Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz* (Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León, 1986).
Sonsoles Cabeza Sánchez-Albornoz, *Semblanza histórico-política de Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz*
(Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1992).
Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz, embajador de España en Portugal, ed. by José Luis Martín (Ávila:
Fundación Sánchez-Albornoz, 1995).

Ferran Soldevila (1894 – 1971)¹

Enric Pujol

(Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Ferran Soldevila i Zubiburu (Barcelone, 1894-1971) est l'un des historiens catalans les plus importants du XX^{ème} siècle. Sa renommée est surtout dûe à l'*Història de Catalunya*, une vision synthétique du passé catalan qu'il édita une première fois en 1934-35 (en trois volumes) et qu'il révisa et augmenta notablement presque trente ans après, dans les années 1962-63². Cette synthèse, dès sa première édition, fut un symbole de la reprise culturelle et nationale catalane contemporaine, au point de surpasser d'autres initiatives similaires (notamment la monumentale *Història Nacional de Catalunya* que Antoni Rovira i Virgili avait commencée en 1922), et de faire de son auteur, Ferran Soldevila, l'historien « de référence » du moment. Cette condition d'historien de référence eut pour conséquence qu'il fut publiquement mieux connu comme historien « généraliste » que comme « médiéviste », ce qui était en réalité sa spécialité. En effet la part la plus importante de la production historiographique de Soldevila est consacrée à la période médiévale (spécialement le XIII^{ème} siècle), et même son œuvre la plus emblématique -l'*Història de Catalunya*- peut être considérée comme une magnifique synthèse de cette époque, qui y occupe une place prééminente (plus de la moitié de texte publié). Naturellement cela n'empêche pas Soldevila de faire, tant dans la fameuse synthèse que dans d'autres travaux, des apports substantiels dans le domaine des Temps Modernes (plusieurs d'entre eux sont aujourd'hui revalorisés) et même dans celui de l'histoire contemporaine.

Où doit-on situer Ferran Soldevila du point de vue de l'historiographie? Sa vaste trajectoire professionnelle couvre la majeure part du XX^{ème} siècle, et a su recueillir l'évolution du médiévisme et de l'ensemble de l'historiographie catalane quasiment tout au long de cette période. Sa formation se fit au sein de l'historiographie « noucentiste », qui devint dominante durant les premières décades du XX^{ème} siècle, grâce à l'institutionnalisation politico-culturelle amorcée par le premier gouvernement autonome catalan moderne, la Mancomunitat de Catalunya (1914-1923). Cet organisme public permit des réalisations capitales pour le développement des études historiques, par exemple l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans ou la Biblioteca de Catalunya³.

Soulignons qu'au cœur des présupposés de l'historiographie « noucentiste » le Moyen-Âge a tenu un rôle capital, ce qui contribue à expliquer l'orientation médiéviste de Soldevila comme de la majorité des compagnons de sa génération. La période médiévale était perçue comme l'apogée nationale. Ce qui non seulement

¹ Texte traduit du catalan par Pere Grau.

² Enric Pujol, *Ferran Soldevila i els fonaments de la historiografia catalana contemporània* (Barcelona-Catarroja: Afers, 1995).

³ On trouvera une caractérisation de ce mouvement dans le *Diccionari d'historiografia catalana* (Barcelona: Enciclopèdia Catalana, 2003).

valorisait le catalanisme politique, -et spécialement le courant conservateur qui dirigeait le gouvernement autonome (la Lliga Regionalista)- mais aussi se conformait fort bien aux points fondamentaux de l'idéologie noucentiste formulé par Eugeni d'Ors -devenu alors le grand idéologue du mouvement noucentiste et, conséquemment, le responsable majeur de la politique culturelle de la Mancomunitat catalane (avec les deux présidents consécutifs de l'institution: Enric Prat de la Riba et Josep Puig i Cadafalch).

L'existence d'un empire médiéval catalan en Méditerranée s'accordait précisément avec les notions-clés du noucentisme, comme l'apologie du méditerranéisme (entendu comme une conception vitale et esthétique déterminée), la défense de la notion d'impérialisme (en tant que démonstration de l'existence d'une nation capable de diffuser la « civilité »), et la revendication de l'idée de l'existence d'une « classicité » catalane héritière de l'Antiquité gréco-romaine. Sur ce troisième point, il faut remarquer que l'idée d'une Catalogne grecque fut, selon Alexandre Cirici i Pellicer, l'un des grands mythes du noucentisme. Ce mythe servit de base pour la définition d'un cycle historique de grande portée, qui commença avec une première influence classique « externe » (le gisement archéologique grec d'Empuries), et culmina, plusieurs siècles plus tard, avec le domaine catalan de la Méditerranée (qui portait en lui une nouvelle classicité médiévale pleinement catalane, du moment que, en une sorte de retour en arrière, il parvenait à dominer la Grèce elle-même). Le passé médiéval qui avait été exalté par l'historiographie romantique antérieure, se maintint durant le noucentisme (après une profonde reformulation) dans le secteur d'analyse privilégié par les études historiques de l'époque.

Dans le haut niveau de développement et de rigueur qu'assuma alors le médiévisme du moment (au-delà des anachronismes et des mystifications inévitables à toute école historiographique du passé et du présent), un érudit tint un rôle très important: Antoni Rubió i Lluch, qui fut le principal maître de Ferran Soldevila. Antoni Rubió i Lluch fut, sans doute, le médiévisme catalan le plus important de la fin du XIX^{ème} siècle (et par conséquent l'un des représentants les plus solides du positivisme tardif qui sut faire la liaison avec les inquiétudes noucentistes). Fils d'une autre grande figure intellectuelle de la Renaissance romantique catalane, Joaquim Rubió i Ors (poète connu sous le pseudonyme de « Gaiter del Llobregat » et également professeur d'histoire à l'Université de Barcelone), Rubió i Lluch hérita de son père la notion d'indépendance culturelle catalane et la passion pour l'histoire. Certainement ce bagage lui permit d'avancer plusieurs formulations fondamentales pour l'historiographie de l'époque.

Citons-en essentiellement trois: la considération du Moyen-Age comme véritable « période nationale » catalane, l'affirmation de la catalanité de l'expansion médiévale (l'un de ses travaux les plus méthodologiques porte le titre *Pourquoi faut-il appeler catalane la politique de la Couronne d'Aragon*), et la nécessité de réaliser une étude systématique et approfondie de la « Grèce catalane » médiévale (qu'il aborda lui-même). L'influence du magistère de Rubió i Lluch sur F. Soldevila fut très importante. Non seulement parce qu'elle fut décisive dans la vocation future du jeune disciple (tous deux furent en relation à l'Université de Barcelone), mais aussi parce que Rubió i Lluch facilita l'entrée de Soldevila dans les principales institutions du moment: les Estudis Universitaris Catalans, parallèles à l'université, et l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans (entité dont Rubió i Lluch lui-même fut président et

où Soldevila entra comme secrétaire-rédacteur de la Section Historico-Archéologique, position qui allait lui permettre d'établir un contact direct avec le meilleur des historiens du moment).

Un second nom doit être mentionné en parlant de la formation d'historien de Soldevila, celui du nord-américain Roger B. Merriman. Il s'agit d'une influence indirecte, d'abord bibliographique, puis épistolaire, mais sans être pour autant moins importante. La lecture de l'œuvre de Merriman *The Rise of the Spanish Empire*, en 1913-14, provoqua une grande impression sur Soldevila, surtout la partie concernant la Catalogne, car, selon ses propres termes: "C'était passer subitement du retrécissement – par timidité ou par myopie – de certains historiens locaux, et du rabaissement systématique de l'importance historique de notre peuple que pratiquaient certains historiens voisins, à un plan de justice, d'amplitude". Dans une lettre de l'époque Soldevila se déclare le disciple de Merriman, et ce dernier dans une missive postérieure lui fait ce suprême éloge: "You are a genius".

La formation noucentiste de Soldevila ne fut qu'un point de départ pour parvenir finalement à une formulation bien personnelle qui recueillit des éléments divers des écoles historiographiques plus importantes apparues en Catalogne et en Europe au cours de sa vie. Il faut préciser que sa génération, bien que formée au sein du noucentisme, ne participa pas à la fascination envers la figure et l'œuvre d'Eugeni d'Ors. Elle se sentit attirée par des problèmes et des doctrines très différentes, et arriva à critiquer vivement le noucentisme «primitif» pour avoir trahi ou inachevé son ambitieux programme initial. Joan Fuster a qualifié les historiens de la génération de Soldevila de «néo-noucentistes», Joan Triadú de «post-noucentistes», et d'autres historiens comme Joaquim Nadal ou Antoni Simon ont parlé de «disciples de Rubió i Lluch» ou de «seconde génération de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans»⁴.

En bonne part ces compagnons de génération de Soldevila (et de façon significative Soldevila lui-même) furent ceux qui prirent la tête de l'opposition culturelle à la dictature du général Primo de Rivera, et qui constituèrent ensuite l'équipe intellectuelle de la Generalitat républicaine. Ce furent les historiens républicains de gauche qui défendirent le gouvernement autonome catalan (même dans les moments les plus difficiles de la guerre civile), et qui furent capables d'articuler une proposition historiographique originale et différente de leurs prédécesseurs noucentistes et des présumés du catalanisme conservateur. Parmi eux il faut mentionner Antoni Rovira i Virgili, Lluís Nicolau d'Olwer, Josep M. Batista i Roca, Jordi Rubió i Balaguer, Manuel Raventós, Carles Pi Sunyer... À partir d'une idéologie démocratique radicale, socialisante et laïque, ils rompirent avec toute conception culturelle élitiste, optèrent pour l'éducation de masse (qui les porta à combiner la haute investigation avec la divulgation généralisée). Ils parlèrent de souverains, non comme incarnation d'un idéal monarchique, mais dans leur qualité de chefs visibles d'un peuple, d'une nation. Ils valorisèrent les éléments démocratiques de l'histoire autochtone, non comme nostalgie romantique, mais comme projection dans le passé de leurs idéaux les plus immédiats.

Voici quels furent les paramètres idéologico-politiques de l'œuvre de maturité de Soldevila, qui permettent de le situer dans un libéralisme de gauche ou une social-démocratie libérale. Ils sont parfaitement détectables dans son *Història de*

⁴ Voir la notice «noucentisme historiogràfic» dans le *Diccionari d'historiografia...*, op.cit.

Catalunya, mais également dans ses travaux centrés sur la période médiévale. Il s'agit de présupposés que Soldevila maintiendra (avec peu de variations) au long de sa vie et au-delà des contingences politiques: que ce soit durant son exil en France (1939-1943) ou après, durant la large période de résistance culturelle anti-franquiste (1943-1971), dont il sera une des figures marquantes.

L'œuvre de Soldevila, centrée plus spécialement sur la période médiévale, débuta dès ses premiers travaux de jeunesse. Sa thèse doctorale, soutenue à Madrid en 1916, a pour thème la reine Maria, épouse d'Alfons el Magnànim (1396-1458), qui dut assumer le gouvernement effectif des territoires catalans durant la longue absence du monarque, préoccupé par la construction d'un empire méditerranéen, avec Naples pour centre politique. Ce texte, profondément révisé, gagna le Prix Patxot en 1922, et finalement fut publié dans le volume collectif *Sobiranes de Catalunya* (1928).

Dans l'évocation de la figure de la reine par Soldevila, nous trouvons deux constantes qui marquèrent la trajectoire historiographique de sa production: l'intérêt pour l'histoire de la femme (rappelons qu'il est l'auteur de la conférence *Les dones en la nostra història*, lue en 1936, et non publiée jusqu'en 1961), et l'intérêt pour la vie privée. Sur ce dernier aspect, il faut remarquer que Soldevila lui-même signalait « de parvenir à l'indiscrétion en ce qui concerne la vie privée des souveraines de Catalogne ». Il faut également tenir compte qu'au début des années quarante il se proposait de rédiger une *Història de la vida privada a Catalunya*, qu'il n'arriva malheureusement pas à mener à terme. Il n'en reste pas moins que cette perspective d'analyse fut toujours présente dans d'autres œuvres qu'il aborda.

De même, de son étape de jeunesse, datent deux grands projets qu'il développa durant sa vie: l'annotation historique des quatre grandes chroniques médiévales catalanes (celles de Jaume I el Conqueridor, de Bernat Desclot, de Ramon Muntaner et de Pere el Cerimoniós), et les biographies (avec prétentions d'exhaustivité) des deux grands monarques catalans du XIII^e siècle: Jaume I el Conqueridor (1208-1276) et son fils Pere el Gran (1240-1285).

L'édition critique de la totalité des chroniques catalanes du Moyen Age et des Temps Modernes fut l'un des projets les plus ambitieux que s'était proposé d'aborder l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans (IEC), quasiment à partir de sa création en 1907. Comme nous l'avons dit, Soldevila commença à travailler dans cette institution en 1915 et, la même année, il fut chargé de l'annotation historique de la *Crònica* de Bernat Desclot (l'annotation philologique étant à la charge de Jordi Rubió). Onze ans plus tard, en 1926, le même travail lui fut demandé pour la chronique de Jaume I el Conqueridor, *el Llibre dels feyts*. Les circonstances politiques contraires au travail normalisé de l'IEC (dictature de Primo de Rivera, guerre civile, franquisme), ajoutées à une extrême méticulosité dans l'édition critique, empêchèrent l'achèvement de ce projet éditorial. Pourtant il semble que, dès les années trente, F. Soldevila eût déjà bien avancé le travail. Il accepta la proposition de l'éditeur Josep M. Cruzet (de l'Editorial Selecta), faite à la fin des années quarante, de se charger de l'annotation des quatre chroniques médiévales les plus connues, que Cruzet voulait publier en un seul volume. Des difficultés économiques ne permirent pas d'aborder l'édition avant le milieu des années soixante, et le volume de l'Editorial Selecta ne fut publié qu'en 1971, année de la mort de Ferran Soldevila.

Quelques années auparavant, cependant, Soldevila souffrit de graves problèmes de santé, qui motivèrent l'intervention dans le projet de son disciple et collabora-

teur Miquel Coll i Alentorn, le grand spécialiste de l'historiographie catalane médiévale. L'annotation historique des quatre grandes chroniques médiévales fut donc la consécration de l'œuvre d'une vie. Ce très vaste chantier conforta Soldevila dans l'idée de considérer les chroniques comme un fonds indispensable pour reconstruire la période historique qu'elles embrassent (première moitié du XII - seconde moitié du XIV), et cela accrut son intérêt pour deux de ses principaux protagonistes: Jaume I et Pere el Gran.

L'étude du règne de Jaume I fut abordée par Soldevila dès sa jeunesse: il publia une petite monographie sur ce monarque en 1926 dans la *Col·lecció Popular Barcino*. A partir de là il lui consacra de nombreux articles et études, jusqu'à la rédaction d'une large synthèse, qui eut une première concrétisation dans le livre *Vida de Jaume I el Conqueridor* (édité par Aedos en 1958). Cet ouvrage fut suivi par une biographie beaucoup plus approfondie et détaillée, dont seul le premier volume fut publié, sous le titre: *Els primers temps de Jaume I*, édité par l'IEC (1968). L'étude de Pere el Gran connut une trajectoire similaire: elle fut commencée avec l'annotation de la chronique de Desclot et avec l'édition de son travail *Pere el Gran: el desafiament amb Carles d'Anjou*, publié dans les pages de la revue des *Estudis Universitaris Catalanes* (1915-16). Comme dans le cas de Jaume I, l'auteur se proposait également (à partir des années quarante) d'offrir une vision générale du règne du monarque. Avec le simple titre *Pere el Gran*, il prenait en considération non seulement les aspects politiques et économiques, mais aussi les éléments caractéristiques du monarque et de la vie quotidienne de l'époque. La brièveté du règne de Pere el Gran (1278-1285) dut sûrement convaincre Soldevila qu'il pouvait atteindre son objectif, mais finalement il ne parvint qu'à rédiger les deux tiers de l'œuvre. La période finale, de 1283 à 1285, restait à faire. Sans aucun doute, c'est là son œuvre maîtresse inachevée. Lui-même ne put voir publiés que quatre volumes (1950-62), édités par l'IEC; mais récemment, en 1995, cette institution a fait une nouvelle réédition en deux volumes de tout ce matériel et y a inclu une partie inédite préparée par M. Coll i Alentorn.

Ces deux monographies détaillées des grands rois du XIII^{ème} siècle prétendaient confronter les deux monarques (père et fils) sur un point que Soldevila jugeait fondamental: la considération que chacun avait de ses domaines. Selon lui, Jaume I, en réalisant par testament la partition de ses royaumes, défendait une conception patrimoniale qui constituait déjà en son temps un anachronisme. Pere el Gran ne suivit pas cette tendance, et défendit une politique d'indivisibilité, qui, aux yeux de Soldevila, était plus cohérente, avec une conception nationale de réel le «maturité». L'objectif de Soldevila était d'ériger Pere el Gran en grand référent symbolique du passé médiéval catalan, parce qu'il avait su combiner un haut degré de maturité nationale avec une politique d'incontestable dimension «européenne» et non seulement «hispanique».

La réalisation des projets jusqu'ici exposés impliquait nécessairement un immense travail de recherche documentaire, que Soldevila se voyait très capable de mener à terme, car sa condition d'archiviste et bibliothécaire lui permettait un contact direct et quotidien avec les fonds nécessaires. A ce propos il ne faut pas oublier qu'à partir de sa réintégration dans le corps des Archives en 1954 (après avoir été «épuré» de son poste durant le premier franquisme), il travailla de nombreuses années aux Archives de la Couronne d'Aragon. Il convient d'ajouter qu'il a même été sur le point d'en être nommé directeur, grâce aux démarches menées par Ramon

Carande; mais finalement il n'obtint pas le poste à cause de la pesanteur de la logique fonctionnariale et de la clause qui figurait dans tous les dossiers d'épuration politique, selon laquelle la personne affectée restait inhabilitée "para el ejercicio de cargos directivos y de confianza".

Dans l'œuvre de Soldevila consacrée à la période médiévale, on ne peut laisser de côté une autre de ses œuvres de caractère général: la *Història d'Espanya*, qu'il rédigea en catalan durant les années quarante, et qu'il ne parvint pas à publier avant la fin de la décade des cinquante, en une version espagnole, augmentée et traduite par lui-même, qui compte huit luxueux volumes illustrés sous la direction de Joan Sales⁵. Son intention était de réaliser une synthèse historique du passé hispanique qui contestât la vision uniformisatrice et de conception castillaniste de l'historiographie espagnole dominante (surtout selon la formulation faite par la génération de 98), que le franquisme érigea en histoire officielle (naturellement dans une version «épurée» des éléments non conformes avec les principes du régime dictatorial). Face à la conception officielle, Soldevila opposait une vision d'ensemble de tous les peuples de la Péninsule ibérique, où le bloc catalan (incluant tous les territoires de langue catalane), le bloc galicien-portugais (incluant le Portugal) et le bloc basque devaient cesser d'avoir un rôle secondaire. Dans le fond il s'agissait de la récupération de l'idéal ibérique défendu traditionnellement par le catalanisme politique, cependant comme Soldevila n'opposait pas le terme «Ibérie» à celui d'«Espagne», mais qu'il les rendait synonymes, cela lui permettait de critiquer la conception castillaniste (propre au nationalisme espagnol d'hier et d'aujourd'hui) en ce qu'elle est limitée.

La conception plurinationale de l'Espagne que défendait Soldevila (non seulement dans son *Història d'Espanya*, mais aussi tout au long de sa vie) heurta frontalement les défenseurs des thèses unitaristes et uniformistes de conception castillaniste. Spécialement importante, dans sa dimension historiographique, fut la polémique qu'il entretenait avec son ancien maître Ramon Menéndez Pidal (maître dans le domaine philologique, mais non dans celui de l'histoire, comme l'a toujours précisé Soldevila lui-même). La discussion ne se limita pas à une suite de répliques et contre-répliques dans journaux et revues, mais se matérialisa en un ouvrage de Soldevila *El compromís de Casp (Resposta al Sr Menéndez Pidal)*, publié en 1965. Menéndez Pidal avait ouvert le feu un an avant avec la préface ouvrant le volume XV de la *Historia de España*, qu'il dirigeait, et qui portait le titre significatif: *El Compromiso de Caspe: autodeterminación de un pueblo*. Dans ce texte Menéndez Pidal affirmait que le peuple catalan, par l'intermédiaire des participants au compromis réunis à Casp, avait exercé le droit d'autodétermination, et avait choisi son candidat, dans une tentative de rétablir la supposée unité péninsulaire de la période wisigothique, dont le principal défenseur était la Castille. Aussi, dans cette préface, Menéndez Pidal qualifiait Soldevila de premier représentant de l'«urgelismo moderno», «una pura fabricación ideológica». Soldevila basa sa réponse sur les points principaux suivants: expliquer les éléments que Menéndez Pidal négligeait ou cachait dans son argumentation (comme l'intervention papale); défaire les déformations qu'il avait faites de son argumentaire; et surtout insister sur la démonstra-

⁵ Deux versions de l'œuvre, française et anglaise, auraient dû paraître, qu'il aurait traduit lui-même, car il connaissait très bien les deux langues. Marié avec Yvonne Lepage, le français était une langue de la famille. Il maîtrisait totalement l'anglais depuis sa jeunesse, ayant été lecteur dans différentes universités anglaises.

tion du caractère illégitime, non légal, de la sentence, un aspect qu'il considérait essentiel, et que de prestigieux historiens lui ont reconnu.

On a très souvent mis en avant les différends d'historiens, comme Jaume Vicens Vives ou Pierre Vilar, avec l'interprétation de Soldevila sur cet épisode historique; tout en sous-estimant les points d'accord, pourtant fort notables, dans cet aspect essentiel. En ce sens il faut noter que les trois historiens maintinrent constamment une opposition radicale aux présupposés fondamentaux de la vision de Menéndez Pidal, non seulement pour l'épisode de Casp, mais bien au-delà: pour la totalité de la conception historique du passé hispanique que défendait cet historien.

La relation de Soldevila avec les autres historiens contemporains ne fut pas si tumultueuse, et n'eut pas un écho public aussi important, encore qu'il y eût souvent entre eux des discussions ponctuelles passionnées, et même une certaine rivalité de personne, comme ce fut le cas pour Jaume Vicens Vives. Cependant avec ce dernier les points d'accord furent également profonds. En ce sens il faut constater que Soldevila finit par adopter certaines des thèses de Vicens Vives, comme l'interprétation des soulèvements de paysans «remences» du XV^e siècle. Ainsi l'explication qu'il donna du phénomène dans la seconde édition de son *Història de Catalunya* est radicalement différente de celle que l'on trouve dans la première édition, précisément parce qu'alors il put intégrer la formulation de Vicens Vives. Le prestigieux médiéviste Ramon d'Abadal dit que Vicens Vives et Soldevila étaient deux historiens complémentaires. C'était une observation qui allait plus loin qu'une simple manière de concilier les deux noms pour lesquels il avait un très grand respect intellectuel. Du respect qu'Abadal éprouvait pour Soldevila, la preuve est donnée par maints articles et entretiens. Inversement la démonstration la plus concluante du crédit que Soldevila porte à d'Abadal réside dans le fait (qu'il reconnut lui-même dans le prologue de son œuvre) qu'il remania complètement, dans la seconde édition de son *Història de Catalunya*, les chapitres relatifs au domaine carolingien et à la «naissance» de la Catalogne, secteurs dans lesquels l'apport d'Abadal avait été révolutionnaire.

Le lien de Soldevila avec les historiens et médiévistes étrangers fut également très important, comme le prouve sa volumineuse correspondance dans laquelle apparaissent les noms si significatifs de Roberto Sabatino Lopez, Heinrich Finke, Edgard Allison Peers, Alberto Boscolo, Yves Renouard, Georges Peyronet, Francesco Loddo-Canepa, Oskar Halecki, Constantin Marinescu, Geoffrey Barraclough et bien d'autres. Sa participation à des congrès internationaux fut décisive pour ces relations. Déjà dans la période d'avant-guerre il fut assidu aux réunions et congrès du Comité International des Sciences Historiques (où il établit des liens avec des savants de la catégorie de Louis François Ganshof ou de Nicolas Iorga). Plus tard, malgré la parenthèse de la Seconde Guerre Mondiale et de l'isolationnisme du premier franquisme, il put continuer à assister à différentes rencontres à travers l'Europe (spécialement en France, Italie et Grande-Bretagne). Sa participation fut également primordiale avec la reprise de l'après-guerre des Congrès d'Histoire de la Couronne d'Aragon, au cours desquels il présenta des travaux de grande importance, comme *Zurita com a historiador*, où est évidente sa fascination pour ce grand chroniqueur aragonais, qui avec Tacite et Ramon Muntaner forme la trilogie des historiens classiques préférés de Soldevila.

La relation entre Soldevila et Pierre Vilar mériterait un chapitre à part. Elle fut très cordiale et empreinte d'un grand respect mutuel, au point que la valorisation

de l'œuvre de Soldevila faite par Vilar dépasse la considération que lui porte l'historiographie catalane de son époque. Vilar non seulement valorisa la compréhension que Soldevila manifesta envers l'importance du fait national dans l'analyse historique, mais aussi valida les grands axes de la périodisation historique proposée par Soldevila: "Moi-même j'ai tenté, au moyen de la recherche des conditions objectives, de rendre visibles certains nouveaux arguments pour renforcer cette périodisation suggérée par Soldevila".

La liste des noms liés à Soldevila ne peut pas laisser de côté celui de certains de ses disciples et élèves qui en reçurent l'influence, directe ou indirecte: Miquel Coll i Alentorn, Joan Mercader, Miquel Tarradell, Josep Fontana, Joan Triadú, Eva Serra, Carme Batlle, Núria Salles, Eulàlia Duran, Joan Ainaud, Santiago Albertí, María Teresa Ferrer Mallol, Anscari M. Mundó... Et heureusement beaucoup d'autres, puisque son magistère rayonna bien au-delà du cercle de ceux qui le connurent, comme c'est toujours le cas avec les grands historiens qui méritent le titre de «classique». Et il ne fait aucun doute que Soldevila fut un des classiques les plus marquants de l'historiographie catalane du XX^{ème} siècle.

Chronologie

- 1894. Naissance à Barcelona.
- 1910-1915. Études de Lettres à l'Université de Barcelona.
- 1915. Secrétaire-redacteur de la section historique et archéologique de l'*Institut d'Estudis Catalans*.
- 1916. Obtient le doctorat à Madrid, avec la thèse sur La reine Marie, épouse d'Alfons le Magnanime.
- 1922. Intègre les services d'archives et bibliothèques de l'état espagnol.
- 1924. Mariage avec Yvonne Lepage, à Leysin, Vaud (Suisse); naîtra de cette union un enfant, Gerard, en 1931.
- 1925. Collaboration au *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, section 'Des de Barcelona', sous le pseudonyme E.V.
- 1926. Correspondant en Espagne pour le *Journal de Genève*, jusqu'en 1936 (guerre civile).
- 1926- 1928. Séjour en Angleterre: lecteur de littérature hispanique à Liverpool.
- 1930. Directeur de la *Revista de Catalunya*. Professeur d'histoire de Catalogne à l'École des Bibliothécaires de Barcelona.
- 1931-1938. Professeur d'Histoire de Catalogne à l'*Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona* (UAB).
- 1934-35. Publication de l'*Història de Catalunya* (révisée et augmentée en 1962-63).
- 1936. Directeur du département d'histoire de Catalogne à l' UAB. Entretient une liaison avec la poète Rosa Leveroni, qui durera jusqu'à sa mort.
- 1939. Exil en France: au Moulin de Bierville (Boissy-la-Rivière) puis à l'Isle-Adam, Banyuls, Beaumes de Venise et Sault de Vaucluse.
- 1943. Retour à Barcelona. Rédaction de l'*Història d'Espanya*, qui ne peut publier jusqu'en 1952-59.
- 1947. Membre de l'*Institut d'Estudis Catalans*.
- 1950. Publication du premier volume de *Pere el Gran*, oeuvre qui restera inachevée.
- 1954. Réintégration aux services des archives (après une épuration politique), à l'*Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó*. (Barcelona)
- 1960. Directeur de la collection 'Episodis de la Història'.
- 1961. Directeur des oeuvres collectives *Història dels catalans* et *Un segle de vida catalana 1814-1930*.
- 1962. Collaboration à *Moments crucials de la Història de Catalunya*.

1964. Docteur *honoris causa* de l'Université de Montpellier
1965. Publication de *El compromís de Casp (Resposta al Sr. Menéndez Pidal)*.
1971. Mort à l'Hôpital de Sant Pau de Barcelona.

Bibliographie

1. Oeuvres de F. Soldevila

- Al llarg de la meua vida* (Barcelona: Edicions 62, 1970) [Journal intime].
Els almogàvers (Barcelona: Barcino, 1952).
Annals/P. Corneli Tàcit, vol. 1, trad. par Ferran Soldevila (Barcelona: Fundació Bernat Metge, 1930).
Barcelona sense universitat i la restauració de la Universitat de Barcelona (1714-1837) (Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 1938).
Els catalans i l'esperit bel·licós (Barcelona: Edicions 62, 1966).
El compromís de Casp (Resposta al Sr. Menéndez Pidal) (Barcelona: Dalmau, 1965; 3^{ème} ed. 1994).
Cronistes, joglars i poetes (Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1996).
Dietaris de l'exili i del retorn, 2 vols (Valencia: E. Climent, 1995-2000).
Les dones en la nostra història (Barcelona: Rafael Dalmau, 1961).
'La formation du sentiment national en Catalogne au moyen âge', *VIII^e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques (Zurich): communications présentées* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1938).
Història de Catalunya, 3 vols (Barcelona: Apha, 1934-35; 2^{ème} ed., 1962-63).
Història de Catalunya, avec Ferran Valls i Taberner (Barcelona: Selecta, 1968).
Història de Catalunya. Curs Mitjà (Barcelona: Associació Protectora de l'Ensenyança Catalana, 1923).
Història de Catalunya il·lustrada (Barcelona: Proa, 1967).
Història de Catalunya. Primeres lectures (Barcelona: Associació Protectora de l'Ensenyança Catalana, 1933).
Historia de España, 8 vols (Barcelona: Ariel, 1952-1959); 2^{ème} éd., 3 vols (Barcelona, Crítica, 1995).
Història de la proclamació de la República a Catalunya (Barcelona: Curial, 1977).
Història dels catalans, 4 vols., éd. par Ferran Soldevila (Barcelona: Ariel, 1961-1974).
La història universal (Barcelona: Duran i Alsina, 1920).
Hores Angleses (Barcelona: Institució de les Lletres Catalanes, 1938); 2^{ème} éd. (Barcelona: Impr. Clarasó, 1947).
Moments crucials de la Història de Catalunya (Barcelona: Vicens Vives, 1962).
Noms propis (Barcelona: Barcelonesa d'edicions, 1994).
Pere II el Gran (Barcelona: Barcino, 1953).
Pere el Gran. Primera Part: L'infant, vol I (Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1995).
Pere el Gran. Segona Part: El regant fins a l'any 1282, vol 2 (Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1995).
Els primers temps de Jaume I (Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1968).
Les quatre grans Cròniques (Barcelona: Selecta, 1971).
Què cal saber de Catalunya? (Barcelona: Club Editor, 1968).
Recerques i Comentaris (Barcelona: Llibreria Catalònia, 1929).
Resum d'Història dels Països Catalans (Barcelona: Barcino, 1975).
Els rossellonesos en la Història de Catalunya (conférence), Sala Aragó de l'Ajuntament de Perpinyà, 17 février 1963.
Un segle de vida catalana, 2 vols, éd. par Ferran Soldevila (Barcelona: Alcides, 1961).
A. Maurois, *Els silencis del Coronel Bramble*, trad. par Ferran Soldevila (Barcelona: Selecta, 2^{ème} éd. 1967).
Síntesi d'Història de Catalunya (Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1994).

Textos d'història i política, 1924-1967 (Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya, 1994).

Vida de Jaume el Conqueridor (Barcelona: Aedos, 1958).

Vida de Pere el Gran i d'Alfons el Liberal (Barcelona: Aedos, 1963).

Volem les nostres estàtues (Genève-Barcelona: PCCP, 1963).

2. Articles

'La qüestió de les prosificacions en les cròniques catalanes', *Revista de Catalunya*, 24 (1926), 605-618.

'La dictature espagnole et l'université', *Journal de Genève*, 27 Avril 1929.

'La España del Cid de Ramón Menéndez Pidal', *Estudios Universitaris Catalans*, 15 (1930), 169-172.

'L'esperit d'Oc et la Catalogne', dans *Le Génie d'Oc et l'homme méditerranéen* (Marseille: Les Cahiers du Sud, 1943).

Faules (Barcelona: Impp. Clarasó, 1948).

'Fe en Catalunya', *Revista de Catalunya*, 84 (1938), 307-312.

'Jaime Vicens Vives, evocado por Ferran Soldevila', *Destino*, 1196, 9 Juillet 1960.

Jaume I (Barcelona: Barcino, 1926).

'La llibertat religiosa', *La Publicitat*, Barcelona, 3 Août 1929, p. 1.

'El llibre de Georges Dwelshauvers', *Revista de Catalunya*, 21 (1926), 261-268.

'Maragall, poeta de fondo y forma', *Ínsula*, 181 (1961), p. 19.

'La nostra història vista pels historiadors britànics. I.- Hallam, Bell, Thorndike', *Revista de Catalunya*, 34 (1927), 349-358.

'Record de Pompeu Fabra. Parlament de Ferran Soldevila', *Tramontane*, Perpinyà, 473-74, XLVIII (1964), 7-8.

'Prefaci a la *Història d'Espanya* (1944)', *Afers*, 32 (1999), 197-203.

'Anglaterra i Catalunya. Les relacions anglo-catalanes durant la Guerra de Successió', *Manuscrits*, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 13 (1995), 13-27.

'Els catalans i el descobriment d'Àfrica a l'Edat mitjana', *Revista de Catalunya*, 10 (1925), 342-350.

'La Catalogne, histoire à vol d'oiseau', dans *L'art de la Catalogne de la seconde moitié du neuvième siècle à la fin du quinzième siècle* (Paris: Cahiers d'Art, 1937).

'Catalunya dins l'Espanya moderna, un llibre de Pierre Vilar. El medi històric', *Serra d'Or*, (mars 1965), 17-20.

'Catalunya ha tingut poesia èpico-popular?: La crònica de Jaume I', *Revista de Catalunya*, 15 (1925), 240-250.

'Catalunya ha tingut poesia èpico-popular?: La crònica de Bernat Desclot', *Revista de Catalunya*, 16 (1925), 346-358.

'Des de Barcelona [Catalunya i la guerra d'Espanya]', *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, 13 (1936-38) 202-205.

'El concepte d'Espanya en la Crònica de Muntaner', *Revista de Catalunya*, 83 (1938), 171-180.

'Conferència sobre els Borja (1931)', *Afers* (Catarroja), 17 (1994), 168-179.

'Rubió i Lluch', *La Publicitat*, 13 Jun 1937, p. 1.

'La reina Maria, muller del Magnànim', dans *Sobiranes de Catalunya* (Barcelona: Fundació C. Rabell i Cibilis, 1928).

'Treballar, treballar i treballar', *Catalunya*, 104 (1939), p. 10.

'Les tres concòrdies', *Revista de Catalunya*, 64 (1930), 289-296.

'El volum segon de la *Història de Catalunya* d'Antoni Rovira i Virgili', *Revista de Catalunya*, 6 (1924), 602-604.

'Voluntat de concòrdia', *Revista de Catalunya*, 97 (1940), 245-248.

'Walter Scott y el renacimiento literario catalán', *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, 3 (1925-1926), 88-90.

‘Zurita com a historiador’, *VII Congr s d’Hist ria de la Corona d’Arag *, (Barcelona, 1963).

3. Publications sur F. Soldevila

Miquel Coll i Alentorn: ‘Ferran Soldevila (1894-1971). La vida i l’obra, *Serra d’Or (SdR)*, Juillet 1971, 13-16.

Josep Fontana, ‘El meu Ferran Soldevila’, *El Contemporani*, 2 (1994), 11-13.

Josep Fontana i Llu s Duran, *Per con ixer Ferran Soldevila* (Barcelona: Publicacions de l’Abadia de Montserrat, 1994).

Dom nec Guans , ‘L’obra liter ria de Ferran Soldevila’, *SdR*, janvier (1966), 56-57.

Joan Mercader, ‘Veinticinco a os de historiograf a catalana. A prop sito de la segunda edici n de la *Hist ria de Catalunya*, de F. Soldevila’, *Hispania*, 23 (1963), 606-623.

Rosa Montoriol, *Ferran Soldevila 1894-1971. Una aproximaci  bio-bibliogr fica* (Catarroja-Barcelona: Afers, 1994).

Baltasar Porcel, ‘Ferran Soldevila o el detallisme abrandat’, *SdR*, Septembre 1967, 35-41.

Enric Pujol, *Ferran Soldevila i els fonaments de la historiograf a catalana contempor nia* (Catarroja-Barcelona: Afers, 1995).

Enric Pujol, ‘Fons per a l’estudi de l’obra de Ferran Soldevila’, *L’Aven *, 187 (1994), 14-16.

Enric Pujol, ‘La proposta historiogr fica de Ferran Soldevila’, *Revista de Catalunya*, Septembre 1994, 48-52.

Enric Pujol, ‘Qui t  por de Ferran Soldevila?’, *SdR*, 417 (1994), 10-11.

Manuel Riu, ‘Necrol gica. Ferran Soldevila (1894-1971)’, *Anuario de Estudios Medievales*, 9 (1974-79), 659-671.

P ire Roqueta (Cercamon), ‘Un historien catalan   l’Universit  de Montpellier’, *Massalia*, 26 Novembre 1964.

Eva Serra, ‘Ferran Soldevila. Vint anys despr s’, *El Contemporani*, 2 (1994), 15-21.

Josep Termes, ‘Ferran Soldevila, en el seu centenari’, *Avui*, Barcelona, 2 Janvier 1994, p. 39.

Joan Triad , ‘Ferran Soldevila: “Passi  i acci ”’, *SdR*, Juillet 1971, p. 21.

Jaume Vicens Vives, ‘Alrededor de la ‘*Historia de Espa a*, de F. Soldevila’, *Destino*, 858, 16 Janvier 1954.

Jaume Vicens Vives, ‘*Hist ria de Catalunya*, per Ferran Soldevila’, *Estudis Universitaris Catalans*, Barcelona, 20 (1935), 166-174.

Pierre Vilar, ‘Ferran Soldevila, historiador’, *SdR*, Janvier 1966, p. 55.

Marie-Dominique Chenu (1895-1990)

Josep-Ignasi SARANYANA
(Universidad de Navarra)

Marie-Dominique Chenu was born in Soisy-sur-Seine in 1895. He entered the seminary in Versailles (1912-13); the Order of Preachers (Dominicans) in 1913, in Le Saulchoir (Belgium, close to the French border) where the Dominicans of the French Province had established their House of Studies after the 1903 expulsion¹. He studied in the Pontifical Athenaeum Angelicum of Rome (1914-20), where he did his thesis under Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange. In 1919, he was ordained priest; went back the following year (1920) to Le Saulchoir, and was incorporated into the Institut historique d'études thomistes established by Pierre Mandonnet in that same year. The Institute put up the "Bibliothèque thomiste" (a collection of monographs on medieval topics) and the Société thomiste which started publishing the *Bulletin thomiste* in 1924.

The Historical Context of the Theology of Saint Thomas

Together with Étienne Gilson, Chenu founded the *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* in 1926. He published his famous *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle* in 1927. Starting 1930, Chenu would travel yearly to Canada spending two months giving classes at the Institute for Medieval Studies in Montréal. This was a center of medieval studies in a French speaking territory, parallel to the one founded by Étienne Gilson in Toronto in 1928.

In 1932, Chenu received the title *magister theologiae*, the highest intellectual and educational recognition granted by the Order of Preachers. He was appointed regent of studies of Le Saulchoir. On March 7, 1936, he delivered his famous conference *Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir*. The booklet was published towards the end of 1937 (Casterman, Tournai). Notwithstanding its narrow diffusion, the text² was subsequently prohibited by the Dominican authorities. Chenu unconditionally accepted this measure. He signed a document retracting his position, articulated in ten theses. His immediate submission to the Roman decision was

¹ Le Saulchoir (from *saule*) can be translated as willow grove or place of willows.

² The text used in this article is the reprinted version: Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir*, ed. by Giuseppe Alberigo and others, preface by René Rémond (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1985), pp. 91-176.

followed by his suspension from the professorial chair of Le Saulchoir³. Later on, the short treatise would be included in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* (Index of Prohibited Books), concretely on February 6, 1942⁴. In this work (a didactic and epistemological study of Theology, previously given by Chenu as a conference in 1936), one can find his fundamental philosophical and theological concerns already developed at this early stage. His main concern was to contextualize the theology of Saint Thomas. This is one of Chenu's principal contributions to modern medieval studies and in a certain sense, it was also the cause of his exclusion from Le Saulchoir. His claims were interpreted –and rightly so– as a critique of neo-Thomism, the dominant school at that time in the Roman Athenaeums. I shall go back on this matter when I present the doctrine of his master Ambroise Gardeil and Chenu's first great monograph, published in 1927.

Theology as inquiry of the signs of the times

a) Critique of the codification of Thomism

Having seen Chenu's first concern (the contextualization of St. Thomas Aquinas), I will now pass on to the second one: his objection to the codification of

³ In order to understand the disciplinary measures imposed on Le Saulchoir and Chenu in 1938, a short summary of the canonical *iter* of this academic entity is provided here. The 1907 *ratio studiorum* of the Dominicans was drawn up by Marie-Joseph Lagrange, Ambroise Gardeil and Paulus von Lœe. The document included the provision for the creation –within the *studia generalia* of the Dominicans– of a biennium of specialization granting the option of the degree of lector in Theology, after having completed the obligatory seven years of institutional studies. The specialization allowed four possibilities: philosophy and the sciences; biblical studies and Oriental languages; historical sciences; Canon Law, Law and Sociology. Since 1921, Le Saulchoir had the Institute for Medieval Studies whose approval depended on the Master General of the Dominicans. It was one of the institutes for specialization foreseen in the 1907 *ratio studiorum*. This Institute was canonically erected by the Holy See on June 29, 1937, according to the 1931 pontifical constitution *Deus scientiarum Dominus*. On this same date, the Faculty of Theology and the Faculty of Philosophy of Le Saulchoir were also created. Counting on the pontifical approval, the three academic centers transferred their seat from Le Saulchoir (Belgium) to Paris, retaining the same name which they had while they were in the small Belgian locality of Le Saulchoir. Cf. Marie-Dominique Chenu, 101.

⁴ After the publication of this work in 1937, there was a rapid succession of events. In 1938, Chenu was called to Rome and was asked to approve ten theological propositions (reproduced by Alberigo on p. 35 of the work quoted in footnote 2, *supra*, ed. facsimile since they were never typed nor printed). In 1940, the Roman Curia began to take measures, publishing an important article in *L'Osservatore Romano*, written by Mariano Cordovani, O.P., theologian of the Pontifical Palace at that time. Afterwards, Cordovani gave an outstanding conference in the Pontifical Athenaeum Angelicum. Meanwhile, Rosaire Gagnebet expressed his objections against Chenu in *Revue thomiste*. Finally, the work was placed on the *Index of Prohibited Books* in 1942, with a clarifying note which appeared in *L'Osservatore Romano*, signed by Pietro Parente (years later, in 1967, Pietro Parente would retract what he wrote in the Vatican newspaper). A few weeks after the work's inclusion in the *Index*, Chenu submitted himself to the dispositions of the Holy Office and was suspended from teaching at Le Saulchoir. This measure was based on a dossier prepared by Mariano Cordovani and Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange. The two persons who were commissioned to inspect Le Saulchoir failed to carry out the job in view of the German occupation of France. Chenu was deprived of the *venia legendi*, was accused of being semi-modernist, and was placed in the same category as Adam Möhler, Maurice Blondel and others. (In spite all these, Chenu was allowed to teach at La Sorbonne and at Le Collège de France, at the end of the Second World War.)

Thomism. Just like his primary concern, this objection would be comprehensible if we take into account some biographical notes which help elucidate the origins of Chenu's preoccupations.

Chenu had a close encounter with the JOC, a movement founded in 1922 in Belgium by the priest Joseph Cardijn (later on cardinal) and in the north of France by the Abbot Guérin in Clichy. In 1928, a group of French chaplains (*aumôniers*) crossed the French-Belgian border and was welcomed by Chenu at Le Saulchoir. Chenu delivered an important conference regarding the spirit of JOC addressed to the *aumôniers* and from then on, he became closely linked to this movement⁵. In his first speech before the JOC chaplains, Chenu made use of a criterion (widely held then in France) which was made popular by professors of the Institut Catholique de Paris: "Theology is born from the light projected on the intelligence by a salvific event –understood in the formal sense-, a salvific event which is taking place today"⁶. This was not a mere neutral principle but rather posed some considerable problems. It implied re-thinking the close links between the dogmas of Creation and the Incarnation⁷ as well as considering world history as relevant to God's designs⁸.

The crux of the matter rests on the affirmation that the light projected on the intelligence seems to proceed in an immediate way from the salvific event. In other words, the formal object *quo* seems to move away from reason illumined by faith and on to the believing reason enlightened by the "salvific event". Thus, the main question lies in determining what is a salvific event. Undeniably, the truth of the faith is lived historically. Can it be said then that historical human beings create their own meaning and the meaning of faith?⁹ How did Chenu understand this question?

One of Chenu's later statements could help us in clarifying his aspiration during the 1920's and 1930's. "Theology is born today when the Word of God enters in touch with the world". Further on, he writes: "After the Council (Vatican II), it is normal to understand as salvific event what John XXIII has denominated as the 'sign of the times'. During that time (referring to 1928), the sign of the times was the evolution of the labor structures which triggered the birth of JOC as an apostolic movement in the Church"¹⁰. By saying this, Chenu was arguing directly against a type of theology understood as mere deduction of behavioral norms from prior principles or propositions ("theology of conclusions"). In 1975, Chenu claimed that the old Catholic Action (1928) was inspired by this type of theology. The new

⁵ Cf. Jacques Duquesne, *Jacques Duquesne interroge le Père Chenu. Un théologien en liberté* (Paris: Le Centurion, 1975), p. 57.

⁶ "La théologie naît de la lumière que projette sur l'intelligence un événement de salut –au sens formel du mot-, un événement de salut qui se déroule aujourd'hui", Duquesne, p. 58.

⁷ Cf. Duquesne, p. 73-74.

⁸ Cf. Duquesne, p. 72.

⁹ Regarding this delicate question, cf. "La unidad de la fe y el pluralismo teológico (1972)", in *Documentos de la Comisión Teológica Internacional (1969-1996)* (Madrid: BAC, 1998), 41-57, concretely p. 44 [thesis 5]).

¹⁰ Cf. Duquesne, 72.

Catholic Action (the specialized Catholic Action or the JOC of the 1920's and 1930's), on the other hand, had reversed this method "à renversé la méthode"¹¹.

Theology understood as a "science of conclusions" (science of what is virtually revealed or the science of construction starting from what is given in Revelation) aimed at pointing out clearly –albeit excessively– the distinction between faith and theology in order to safeguard the transcendence of the faith from the human fallibility of theologians¹². Chenu, on the other hand, was concerned with the direct engagement of faith and theology with history.

At this point, I will now examine Chenu's concern regarding the possible codification of Thomism. Chenu understands that for Saint Thomas, the central concern of theology is not its conclusions, although indeed Saint Thomas does not discount the formulation of new conclusions. Theology, for Saint Thomas, is defined as the endeavor aimed at a better understanding of the revealed mysteries and the structuring of all human knowledge in relation to this revelation. The theology of Saint Thomas, therefore, does not represent a centrifugal movement that starts from the nucleus of the faith and goes outwards arriving at far out conclusions. Rather, it entails a centripetal movement, starting from all reality and going towards the center such that all things would be illuminated from the light coming from this central point. This was what Chenu claimed and he was right. However, he failed to articulate well the nuances of his assertions which consequently provoked confusion and hostility towards neo-Scholasticism.

b) Critique of the codification of the Social Doctrine of the Church

In a conference he gave during the 1947 Social Week of Paris, Chenu talked for the first time about "the determining causes which rule in the mode of a superstructure, understood in the Marxist sense"¹³. Previously, Chenu was opposed to the codification of Thomism in the name of an orthodox Thomism that was at the same time open to new problems and influences. This time, Chenu sets himself against the "Social Doctrine of the Church, understood as a code promulgated by the Church"¹⁴. Nonetheless, to reject the "codification of Thomism" is not the same as to object against a hypothetical "codification of the Social Doctrine of the Church". The pontifical Magisterium had pointed out that certain teachings of the Social Doctrine are not completely conditioned by historical changes. Thus, one cannot equate a Thomism of the open kind (notwithstanding the difficulties it poses) with a Social Doctrine of the Church that is open to new ideologies, one that does not exclude Marxism.

¹¹ In his 1937 conference *Une école de théologie: le Saulchoir*, Chenu identified the characteristic signs of the times of the 1930's: a certain anti-colonial consciousness (still weak then); a greater international solidarity; an increasing awareness of multi-culturalism (plurality of civilizations), such that European culture was considered as one more, albeit of greater importance. This implied giving up the Eurocentrism of the Catholic Church, for example, more openness on the part of the Roman Curia towards Prelates from other sides; and finally, the important development of the labor world. Cf. Duquesne, 71.

¹² Cf. José Luis Illanes, *Sobre el saber teológico* (Madrid: Rialp, 1978), p.64-67.

¹³ Cf. Duquesne, 60.

Chenu's major medieval monographs

I have traced the methodological framework of Chenu's medieval studies: the historical contextualization of Aquinas and his objection to the systematization of Thomism. I will now examine his principal contributions to medieval studies. In chronological order, Chenu's three major medieval monographs are: *La théologie comme science au XIII^e siècle* (1927, 1942, 1957); *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (1950, 1954); and *La théologie au douzième siècle* (1957, 1966). I will comment on each of these books, according to the chronological order of each edition, keeping in mind that each edition contained corrections and added texts, and I will also comment on the ensuing inter-connections of each book with Chenu's other works.

a) *La théologie comme science au XIII^e siècle*

This work -theology as a science in the 13th century- which first appeared in 1927 constitutes Chenu's first study on the contextualization of Saint Thomas Aquinas. An expanded version came out later in 1942. The initial focus of the book was based on a 40-page article that was published in the 1927 volume of the *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*. At that time, Chenu had already been staying in Le Saulchoir for seven years and was then under the influence of his great master Ambroise Gardeil and indirectly was under the shadow of Marie-Joseph Lagrange, founder of the École pratique d'études bibliques of Jerusalem¹⁵.

As is correctly observed, Lagrange's 1890 Jerusalem foundation became the principal model for the new *ratio studiorum* of the Dominicans approved in 1907¹⁶. Lagrange introduced the historical method in the study of Sacred Scriptures. Gardeil (who directed Le Saulchoir from 1894 to 1911), on the other hand, adopted the historical method in the study of philosophy, concretely St. Thomas' philosophy. Gardeil's program was fashioned after the new journal *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* [=RSPTh] which was founded in 1907. Note that the journal's title bears the plural term sciences, referring to the sciences of philosophy and theology. Two points can be clearly deduced from this: first, St. Thomas the philosopher -which he was in fact- could not be dissociated from St. Thomas the theologian; and second, the notion that there is a single philosophical and theological science is outrightly rejected. This stance was plainly an attack on an imposing obstacle during those years: the monolithic rock of neo-Thomism, considered as the sure, definitive, and unappealable interpreter of Thomism (to cite an example, consider the controversy raised by the formulation of the XXIV Thomist theses¹⁷). Moreover, the term "philosophical and theological sciences" quieted the suspicions that could have been raised by considering Le Saulchoir as an experimental attempt at his-

¹⁴ This preliminary study would end up in a controversial book *Pour une théologie du travail* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1955). Some regarded it as a naïve book while others, on the other hand, considered it as a substantial piece of work which reveals Chenu's close affinities to Marx and Hegel. Certainly, this is a matter worth considering, but this is not the moment to enter into this question.

¹⁵ Cf. Jean Guitton, *Retrato del Padre Lagrange: el que reconcilió la ciencia con la fe* (Madrid: Palabra, 1993).

¹⁶ *Marie-Dominique Chenu: Studi di lessicografia filosofica medievale*, ed. by Giacinta Spinosa (Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2001), xviii. Fr. Lagrange was born in 1855 and died in 1938. Fr. Gardeil was born in 1859 and passed away in 1931. Pierre Félix Mandonnet, the third protagonist of this intellectual adventure, was born in 1858 and died in 1936. The three were obviously contemporaries.

¹⁷ Cf. Josep-Ignasi Saranyana, *Grandes maestros de la teología* (Madrid: Atenas, 1994), I, pp. 190-206.

toricizing dogmas which in turn would have proved risky just at that moment when the Decree *Lamentabili*¹⁸ and the Encyclical *Pascendi*¹⁹ were about to come out.

Gardeil attempted to criticize Melchior Cano's *De locis* in three long works published in 1908²⁰. Gardeil claimed that Cano's displacement of history as one of the three auxiliary sources, concretely designating it to the tenth and last place, was largely responsible for the historical de-contextualization so evident in 17th century Theology. Clearly, *auctoritas* has won over history and reason²¹. Gardeil's opinions may have been exaggerated and provocative. Nonetheless, his views would have a lot of bearing on Le Saulchoir in the 1920's and 1930's.

Gardeil's critique of Cano is certainly exaggerated. History was not extremely marginalized in Cano's work, contrary to Gardeil's claim. Cano considered the traditions of the Apostles as one of the two "proper and fundamental" sources. Moreover, the Catholic Church, who preserves the great Tradition and the venerable particular traditions, was the first of Cano's "proper and declarative" sources. History was implicitly included here. However, Gardeil argued that Cano's concept of history should be the same as the historicists' notion, implying that historicism would invalidate Cano's formulations. While Cano considered history as mere material source, historicists, on the other hand, regarded history as the interpretive light of events and documents. Obviously, both positions are complementary because philosophy is within history and it has a history. Nonetheless, a unilateral stance favoring historicism poses a problem which I would put in this way. If philosophy is historical, is there a binding thread that runs through the historical course, one that is external to it? This question clearly comes close to a Hegelian stance, a problem that characterizes some of Chenu's more philosophical views²².

To address this matter, I will go back to Chenu's first book on theology as a science in the 13th century²³. The main thesis of this work is as follows: in the 12th century, sacred doctrine was an organic discipline whose principal subject matter was the Scripture and the articles of the faith. Starting with Saint Thomas, both Scriptures and the articles of the faith would constitute a principle that is previously known and from which an Aristotelian demonstrative method would be elaborated²⁴. In the second edition of this monograph, Chenu would point out that Saint Thomas was not the first one to apply the Aristotelian demonstrative method to theology. William of Auxerre had initiated it in 1220 and this method would finally culminate a little before 1270 with the writing of the first question of the

¹⁸ July 3, 1907, DS 3401-3466.

¹⁹ September 8, 1907, DS 3475-3500.

²⁰ Ambroise Gardeil, 'La notion du lieux théologique', RSPHTh 2 (1908), 51-73; 246-276; 484-505.

²¹ The theological sources according to Melchior Cano's *De locis theologicis* are: two fundamental and proper ones (Sacred Scriptures and Apostolic Tradition); five proper and declarative sources (the Catholic Church, the Councils, the Church of Rome, the Fathers of the Church, and the Scholastic theologians); and three auxiliary ones (reason, the philosophers and doctors of civil law, history).

²² Cf. for example, Gastond Fessard, *De l'actualité historique* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1960), II: *Progressisme chrétien et apostolat ouvrier*.

²³ Citations are from the following edition: *La théologie comme science au XIII^e siècle* (3rd ed. Paris: J. Vrin, Paris 1957).

²⁴ *La théologie comme science au XIII^e siècle*, p. 11.

Summa Theologiae. This theological method entailed a proper epistemology which gave birth to a new and fundamental analytical tool: the notion of “sub-alternate science”. In his first monograph, Chenu applied his doctrine of contextualization. St. Thomas would be unintelligible without the presence of the Stagirite. Neither would he be comprehensible if isolated from the slow maturation process of the professional theological task in the University, a new institution born at a concrete historical period.

***b) Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin*²⁵**

This monograph was prepared for his students of Le Saulchoir (no reference was made to the fact that while Chenu was publishing in 1950, he was suspended from teaching in this center of studies) and of the Institut d'Études médiévales d'Ottawa in Montreal. It is designed to be an initiation to Saint Thomas for those who afterwards have to read Saint Thomas directly. The main idea is clearly expressed in the “presentation”: there is no solution of continuity, there is no “gap” between “la vérité de l'esprit et les conditions de son élaboration”²⁶. Saint Thomas, although he was a genius, was clearly in solidarity with the community. “Truth is not less true just because it is recorded in time”²⁷. Here, the reader will find Chenu's aim of contextualizing Saint Thomas' work within the medium where it sprung and developed, i.e., the spiritual medium (the evangelism of the mendicants and the discovery of Aristotle) as well as the institutional medium (university, literary and social media).

The work certainly fulfills its goals. It is now considered a classic of medieval studies. The didactic aims are clearly achieved. A complementary bibliography and “notes de travail” are included at the end of each chapter. The book is divided into two parts. The first part is entitled “the work” (the historical and social context, the literary genres of Saint Thomas, vocabulary, documentation and redaction). The second part corresponds to the writings of Saint Thomas (with a short but brilliant presentation of each work, the exceptional quality of which has not diminished with time).

***c) La théologie au douzième siècle*²⁸**

This book is a collection of Chenu's unpublished and previously published works that have been revised for this edition. As Étienne Gilson writes in the preface, the work has two aims. First, to point out that the usual division between the 12th and 13th centuries employed in the manuals, as typified in volume 217 of Jean-Paul Migne's *Patrologia latina*, should be revised and that a fundamental continuity be established between the 12th and 13th centuries, between the patristic and medieval periods. This monograph underscores the fact that Saint Thomas did not only incorporate the best achievements of the patristic age and the 12th century into his speculative synthesis but that both (patristic and 12th century) form a unity whereby Theology, Philosophy, Spirituality and Mysticism cannot and should not be sepa-

²⁵ Citations are from the following edition: *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (2nd ed. Paris-Montréal: J. Vrin – Institut d'Études Médiévales, 1954).

²⁶ *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, p. 6.

²⁷ “La vérité n'est pas moins vraie, pour être inscrite dans le temps”, *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin*.

²⁸ Citations are from the following edition: *La théologie au douzième siècle* (2nd ed. Paris: J. Vrin, 1966).

rated. The divisions established in the Middle Ages had a didactic purpose. If the researcher or the teacher is not careful, such divisions would end up being fixed divisions with no possibility of introducing new lines. In such case, the understanding of the historical course would be distorted²⁹.

Chenu acknowledges his debt to the specific studies and monographs of Étienne Gilson, Arthur Landgraf, Odo Lottin, and especially Joseph de Ghellinck. Chenu presents an “organic history” of the 12th century considered to be a great theological century and the hinge of Western Medieval period. In this work, the references to Ghellinck, pioneer and master in the study of medieval literary genres, clearly reflect Chenu’s preference. Through the analysis of language and literary styles, Chenu overcomes the inadequate division found in the manuals between history of theology and history of spirituality, considered as if they were two immovable spheres during the High Middle Ages³⁰. Chenu dismisses the charge that he was inspired by ideological prejudices in writing this monograph. He admits that he was moved by the overriding passion of repairing “les liaisons internes” between facts and texts. This subjective re-construction is unavoidably risky as it could lead to fanciful results. Nonetheless, Chenu insists that the risk should be taken. He evokes the historical interpretation of the *Aufklärung* which ended up in dissolving the uncompromising originality of the religious phenomenon. With respect to this, he proposes his own hypothesis that “the history of theology is, in a certain way, intrinsic to theology itself. A perfect history of theology would be heading towards a theology of history”³¹.

Chenu points out that *La théologie au douzième siècle* was written during the second stage of the *Annales* (the first edition came out in 1957). The “total history” started to be interested in the religious phenomenon, thereby changing the orientation of *Les Annales*³².

Back to the past: Le Saulchoir’s significance

Le Saulchoir’s history is closely linked to the person of Chenu and more specifically, to a conference he gave on March 7, 1937, feast of Saint Thomas³³. To this

²⁹ *La théologie au douzième siècle*, pp. 8-9.

³⁰ *La théologie au douzième siècle*, p. 13.

³¹ *La théologie au douzième siècle*, p. 14.

³² In 1956, Lucien Febvre passed away. Previously, he was responsible for orienting *Les Annales* towards economic topics and steering clear of political history. Fernand Braudel succeeded him as editor of the journal.

³³ The contents of this 1937 conference were: Introduction; the first chapter entitled “De Saint Jacques au Saulchoir;” the second chapter “Esprit et methods;” the third chapter “La théologie;” the fourth chapter “La Philosophie;” and the fifth chapter “Les Études médiévales.” The main thesis can be summed up as follows: The Order of Preachers was founded for the sake of pursuing studies. In its foundational charisma, both contemplation and study are perfectly welded. Hence, since its inception, the Dominicans established universities in different cities, specially in Paris. The teaching and study of philosophy and theology leaned heavily on the great Dominican, St. Thomas Aquinas. If the aspect of study is neglected, the Order would decline. The study of Thomas Aquinas should not be allowed to stagnate or be codified for it is something dynamic. Neither can the theology and philosophy of Saint Thomas be separated from Spirituality and the Mystical. Le Saulchoir attempted to embody these ideals, specified in the 1907 *ratio studiorum* which included specializations of the *studia generalia*. Le Saulchoir chose “History” as its specialization.

day, the proscription of this work within the Order of Preachers and its subsequent inclusion in the Index of Prohibited Books in 1942, remains a mystery.

Étienne Fouilloux made a careful research and deep study of the origin of these measures. He did not give definitive conclusions regarding this matter. He did allude to a fight between some Roman theologians and their French counterparts³⁴. The dossier prepared by the Dominicans Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange (1877-1964) and Mariano Felice Cordovani (1883-1950) –the latter being the theologian of the Pontifical Palace at that time- contains the famous ten propositions accepted by Chenu in 1938³⁵. It also contains five vague charges: 1) semi-modernism (establishing a continuity between Johann Adam Möhler, Maurice Blondel and Marie-Dominique Chenu); 2) philosophical and theological relativism, undermining the authority of Saint Thomas recommended by the Holy See; 3) dogmatic relativism; 4) incorporating “spiritual experience” to the definition of Theology as a science; and 5) defending the creative protagonism of the Church’s Tradition and *a fortiori*, of human history, in doctrinal matters (questions of *fides et mores*)³⁶.

Conclusions

During his time, Chenu was an outstanding exponent of contextualized hermeneutics of St. Thomas’ theology and philosophy. His path-breaking views were certainly hard-earned. Some specialists considered his views as shocking in 1937. Étienne Gilson who was also committed to the same medievalist enterprise, remained at his side.

Chenu applied the same methodology (aside from being a methodology, it was also a way of understanding the history of philosophy and history of theology) some years afterwards. In the field of “total history,” he tried to posit a dialogue between historical synthesis and the postulates of Marxism. At that time, shortly after the

³⁴ Cf. Étienne Fouilloux, ‘Le Saulchoir en procès (1937-1942)’, in Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir*, 37-59, here p. 55. It should be pointed out that not all historians agree with the thesis of a «fight between friars».

³⁵ The famous ten theses accepted and signed by Chenu in Rome in 1938 are: “1. Formulae dogmaticae enuntiant veritatem absolutam et immutabilem. 2. Propositiones verae et certae, sive in philosophia sive in theologia, firmatae sunt et nullo modo fragiles. 3. Sacra Traditio novas veritates non creat, sed firmiter tenendum est depositum revelationis, seu complexum veritatum divinitus revelatarum, clausum fuisse morte ultimi apostoli. 4. Sacra Theologia non est quaedam spiritualitas quae invenit instrumenta suae experientiae religiosae adaequata; sed est vera scientia, Deo benedicente, studio acquisita, cuius principia sunt articuli Fidei et etiam omnes veritates revelatae quibus theologus fide divina, saltem informi, adhaeret. 5. Varia systemata theologica, quoad ea in quibus ab invicem dissentiunt non sunt simul vera. 6. Gloriosum est Ecclesiam habere systema S. Thomae tanquam valde orthodoxum, i.e. veritatibus Fide valde conforme. 7. Necesse est veritates theologicas per S. Scripturam et Traditionem demonstrare, necnon earum naturam et intimam rationem principiis et doctrina S. Thomae illustrare. 8. S. Thomas, etsi proprius theologus, proprie etiam philosophus fuit; proinde, philosophia eius in sua intelligibilitate et veritate non pendet ab eius theologia, nec enunciat [sic] veritates mere relativas sed absolutas. 9. Theologo in processu scientifico suo valde necessarium est metaphysicam S. Thomae adhibere et ad regulas dialecticae diligenter attendere. 10. De aliis scriptoribus et doctoribus probatis servandum est moderamen reverentiale in modo loquendi et scribendi, etiamsi in quibusdam defectuosi inveniantur.” (cf. Giuseppe Alberigo, ‘Christianisme en tant qu’histoire et “théologie confessante”’, in Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir*, 35)

³⁶ Cf. Fouilloux, ‘Le Saulchoir en procès (1937-1942)’, 57-58.

Second World War, the collaboration between communists and Christians of the Resistance was still fresh in everyone's minds as well as the economic orientation of the *Annales*. Chenu's dialogue with Marxism unleashed another important debate in the 1950's, following his publication of *Pour une théologie du travail*. Undoubtedly, his attitude (if it was really naïve) was not a mere product of the attraction of the "signs of the times." The question was more complicated and more profound. Probably dazzled by the rise of the social sciences and economics in the field of historiography, Chenu failed to detect that the underlying presuppositions of Marxism were incompatible with the Christian view of the world and of the person.

To conclude, I would say that Chenu was an unrepentant "provoker" and perhaps a bit one-sided although some of his views did break new grounds in medieval studies and in Thomist exegesis.

Chronology

- 1895. Born in Soisy-sur-Seine (Francia).
- 1912-1913. Seminarian in Versailles.
- 1913-1914. Novice of the Order of Preachers in Le Saulchoir (Belgium, near the French border).
- 1914-1920. Licentiate and doctorate in Theology in the Pontificium Athenaeum Angelicum of Rome.
- 1919. Ordained priest in Rome.
- 1920. Professor in Le Saulchoir.
- 1924. He starts editing the journal *Bulletin thomiste*.
- 1926. He founds, together with Étienne Gilson, the *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*.
- 1928. First contacts with the JOC movement.
- 1930. He starts his teaching experience in the Institut d'Études Médiévales d'Ottawa, in Montréal (Canada).
- 1932. He obtains the degree of *magister theologiae*. Regent of studies in Le Saulchoir.
- 1936. On the 7th of March he delivers his famous conference *Une école de théologie: le Saulchoir*, published at the end of 1937.
- 1938. He is suspended from teaching at Le Saulchoir.
- 1942. On the 6th of February his book *Une école de théologie: le Saulchoir* is included in the *Index librorum prohibitorum*. He is denied the *venia docendi*.
- 1953. He starts lecturing at La Sorbonne.
- 1955. Publication of *Pour une théologie du travail*, where he develops his theses of the dialogue of Catholic Theology with marxism, which he had presented for the first time during the Social Week of Paris, in 1947.
- 1962-1965. He takes part as theologian in the Second Vatican Council.
- 1974. During one of the plenary sessions of the 'International Congress of Saint Thomas Aquinas' in Rome he delivers an important conference with the title *S. Thomas innovateur dans la créativité d'un monde nouveau*. This conference constitutes his rehabilitation as a scholar of Thomas Aquinas.
- 1990. Death in Paris.

Selected Bibliography

1. Livres

Les études de philosophie médiévale (Paris: Hermann, 1939)

La théologie comme science au XIII^e siècle (1927; 3th. ed., Paris: J. Vrin ['Bibliothèque thomiste,' 33] 1957).

Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin (Paris/Montréal: J. Vrin/Institut d'Études Médiévales ['Publications de l'Institut d'études médiévales', 11], 1950; 2nd ed., 1954).

La théologie au douzième siècle (Paris: J. Vrin ['Études de philosophie médiévale,' 45], 1957; 2nd ed., 1966).

St. Thomas d'Aquin et la théologie (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1959)

Nature, man, and society in the twelfth century; essays on new theological perspectives in the Latin West (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

L'éveil de la conscience dans la civilisation médiévale (Montréal: Institut d'Études Médiévales, 1969).

Marie-Dominique Chenu: Studi di lessicografia filosofica medievale, ed. by Giacinta Spinosa (Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2001).

2. Bibliography on Chenu

Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir, ed. by Giuseppe Alberigo and others (Paris: Du Cerf, 1985), pp. 91-176 (1st ed.: Casterman, Tournai, 1937).

Jacques Duquesne, *Jacques Duquesne interroge le Père Chenu. Un théologien en liberté*, (Paris: Le Centurion, 1975).

Gaston Fessard, *De l'actualité historique* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1960), II: *Progressisme chrétien et apostolat ouvrier*.

Ernst H. Kantorowicz (1895-1963)*

Francisco Javier CASPISTEGUI
(Universidad de Navarra)

*Im blick
Des Morgenlandes ungeheuren traum,
Weisheit der Kabbala und Römerwürde
Feste von Agrigent und Selinunt'*
(Stefan George, *Der siebente Ring*, 1907)¹

Fasciste, rénovateur de l'histoire ou post-moderne: lecteur d'un historien

L'axe biographique est une des possibilités d'approche du passé, mais il s'avère un peu paradoxal que celui qui construit le récit historique devienne à son tour centre d'intérêt. L'Ernst Kantorowicz historien fait pendant au Kantorowicz témoin et, parfois, au Kantorowicz protagoniste de l'histoire. Comme le signale Alain Boureau, au moment de construire la biographie d'un personnage, c'est-à-dire, de quelqu'un que nous considérons comme suffisamment remarquable pour faire figure de référence, nous devons choisir les fonds sur lesquels nous voulons mettre en valeur une trajectoire personnelle. Mon intention est de tracer un rapide panorama du personnage, des motifs qui conduisent à le considérer comme un grand historien et d'y ajouter une réflexion sur sa place dans l'histoire de l'historiographie actuelle, sans perdre de vue le cadre général dans lequel il s'inscrit dans le cours du temps où il a vécu.

Points de repère de la trajectoire biographique d'un historien

Sa vie peut s'articuler autour de deux grandes ruptures qui coïncident avec autant de moments clés de l'histoire du monde occidental: 1914-18 et 1933-38. Il en ressort trois périodes qui se distinguent par leurs événements biographiques. Il y a cependant une autre possibilité de structurer la biographie de Kantorowicz en se basant sur son travail intellectuel. Dans ce cas, l'axe —pour indiquer une date qui ferait fonction de balise— serait la publication de la biographie sur Frédéric II, en 1927. Et nous pourrions encore inclure une autre référence temporelle qui l'ins-

* Ce texte doit beaucoup à un groupe d'historiens qui posèrent leurs questions au cours de la session lors de laquelle fut exposée sa première version. A tous, merci. Je remercie aussi Paul Freedman pour ses suggestions, Santiago Leoné —une fois de plus— pour son aide toujours généreuse et Jesús Longares par sa disponibilité, ainsi que Jaume Aurell et Francisco Crosas pour leur patience. La traduction, si soignée, est de Marie Blanchy.

¹ Poème dédié à Frédéric II. Recueilli dans Cecil Maurice Bowra, *The Heritage of Symbolism* (Londre: MacMillan, 1943), p. 126. ('Dans le regard/ La vision de l'immense rêve d'Orient/ et la sagesse de la Cabale, la dignité romaine,/ les fêtes d'Agrigente et Sélinonte').

crirait dans une tradition de pensée allemande, aux racines européennes évidentes par conséquent; un long temps d'importance structurelle si nous nous en tenons à la terminologie braudélienne. Mais même dans ce cas nous pourrions préciser un peu plus et insérer sa trajectoire comme constructeur de l'histoire dans un cadre qui tiendrait compte de ses composantes de rénovation historiographique, et même d'anticipation sur des positions influentes à la fin de son siècle. Je laisse ceci pour la fin.

Je commencerai par traiter des axes temporels, par son histoire *événementielle*:

a) 1895-1919

Il naquit dans une influente famille juive commerçante de Poznan, capitale d'une zone, la Posnanie, incorporée à la Prusse au XVIII^e siècle, qui avait vécu un processus de germanisation intense, malgré les conflits internes d'une société polarisée autour des Allemands et des Polonais qui persistèrent jusqu'à la période postérieure à la I^{ère} Guerre Mondiale². Au sein de cette société se trouvait la communauté juive où la famille Kantorowicz avait une certaine position sociale, en particulier grâce à sa bonne situation économique, fruit de la fabrique de boissons qui lui appartenait³. Benjamin de trois enfants, il reçut durant son enfance l'éducation d'une institutrice britannique dont il apprit l'anglais; et il alla à l'école de Poznan entre 1904 et 1907⁴. Ensuite, la jeune génération Kantorowicz se tourna beaucoup plus vers Berlin que vers Varsovie, centre d'une Pologne par laquelle ils ne se sentirent jamais vraiment attirés. Dans la capitale de l'Empire allemand, il fut élève du Kaiserin Augusta-Viktoria Gymnasium, où il s'intéressa plus spécialement aux cours de latin, grec et histoire⁵.

On trouve une description d'un lycée allemand quelques années plus tard chez Eric Hobsbawm: 'Il s'agissait d'une école parfaitement conventionnelle dans la plus pure tradition conservatrice prussienne, fondée en 1890 pour satisfaire les nécessités d'un quartier de classe moyenne en expansion constante et rapide. [...] Une école prussienne à connotation militaire était naturellement d'esprit protestant, profondément patriotique et conservatrice'. Il fait cependant une distinction entre l'ambiance du lycée et son enseignement: 'Ce que j'ai appris dans les cours qui se donnaient dans ces salles de classe n'est pas si clair. Je me rends compte qu'elles n'ont pas constitué une partie spécialement significative de mon expérience scolaire'. Il

² Eckhart Grünwald, *Ernst Kantorowicz und Stefan George. Beiträge zur Biographie des Historikers bis zum Jahre 1938 und zu seinem Jugendwerk 'Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite'* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1982), pp. 7-15; Lech Trzeciakowski, 'Die Politik der preußischen Regierung in der Jahren gegenüber den Juden im Großherzogtum Poznan'; Krzysztof A. Makowski, 'Die jüdische Bevölkerung im Poznaner Land in der Teilungszeit' et Darius Matelski, 'Nationalitätenverhältnisse in Großpolen in den Jahren 1918-1920', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz (1895-1963). Soziales Milieu und wissenschaftliche Relevanz*, éd. de Jerzy Strzelczyk (Poznan: Instytut Historii UAM, 2000), pp. 25-32, 33-41 et 43-67.

³ Sur sa famille et ses affaires, voir: E. Grünwald, *Ernst Kantorowicz und Stefan George*, pp. 4-6; Stanislaw Nawrocki, 'Die Geschichte der Familie Kantorowicz und ihrer Firma' et Jan Skuratowicz, 'Im kreisder der Kantorowicz, Jaretzki und Samter. Die Residenzen des Jüdischen Bürgertums in Poznan vor 1918', *Ernst Kantorowicz (1895-1963)*, éd. de Jerzy Strzelczyk, pp. 77-91 et 93-104; Adam S. Labuda, 'Ein Poznaner Itinerar zu Kantorowicz', dans *Geschichtskörper. Zur Aktualität von Ernst H. Kantorowicz*, éd. de Wolfgang Ernst et Cornelia Vismann (Munich: Fink, 1998), pp. 73-91.

⁴ E. Grünwald, 15-17; Witold Molik, 'Ernst Kantorowicz' Schuljahre in Poznan', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz (1895-1963)*, 69-76.

⁵ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', dans, *On four modern humanists, Hofmannsthal, Gundolf, Curtius, Kantorowicz*, éd. de Arthur R. Evans Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), p. 155. Une version antérieure dans 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', *Romance Philology*, 18 (1964), 1-15.

mentionne les professeurs en des termes qui ne sont guère positifs: 'ils avaient tous de fortes réminiscences d'un patriotisme allemand conservateur passionné', la plupart ayant un passé militaire. Tout comme dans le Munich de 1919, Hobsbawm lui-même commente l'appui aux radicalismes de droite dans le milieu universitaire et intellectuel: 'parmi ceux qui militaient à l'extrême gauche, relativement peu d'entre nous étaient des intellectuels, ne serait-ce qu'à cause du fait que même dans un pays à fort taux de scolarisation comme l'Allemagne, plus de quatre-vingt-dix pour cent des jeunes n'avaient même pas accès à l'enseignement secondaire. Et parmi la jeunesse intellectuelle, ceux de gauche représentaient une modeste minorité. Le gros des étudiants était à coup sûr de droite, quoique –comme dans ma propre école– pas nécessairement de la droite national-socialiste. Parmi les universitaires le soutien à Hitler était beaucoup plus fort'⁶. La situation dans les premières années du siècle n'était pas tellement différente. De plus, pour un jeune comme Kantorowicz, membre d'une famille naturalisée, le nationalisme pouvait apparaître comme le moyen le plus naturel de s'intégrer à la culture de l'Allemagne du début du siècle⁷.

A l'issue de sa formation basique –mais, nous l'avons vu, exceptionnelle en soi– et ayant obtenu l'*Abitur*, le titre de bachelier, il s'en fut en 1913 à Hambourg, où il commença à se préparer à sa future intégration à la firme commerciale familiale. Lorsqu'éclata la guerre, il s'engagea volontaire au mois d'août 1914. Il fut bientôt envoyé sur le front occidental, à Verdun, où il fut blessé. Après plusieurs montées en grade au vu de ses mérites, et remis de ses blessures, il alla en Ukraine, puis dans l'Empire Ottoman, sur la construction du chemin de fer Bagdad-Constantinople, apparemment grâce à l'appui d'un beau-frère⁸. Là-bas il put observer autant la vie quotidienne au Moyen-Orient que l'immense impact d'une élite réduite mais organisée, celle des Jeunes Turcs, qui déjà en 1909 avait atteint le pouvoir à la suite d'un coup d'état⁹. Quoiqu'il en soit, ce qui était significatif de ce groupe, c'était sa tentative, depuis l'excellence d'un idéal et la conviction de ses propres capacités, de transformer le pays, en renonçant dans ce cas à la tradition face à l'importance de la nouveauté, de la modernité. Convaincus de l'incapacité de l'autocratie, qui causait retard économique et faiblesse militaire, ainsi que de la soumission du peuple à la volonté corrompue et oppressive des dirigeants, ils considéraient que le constitutionnalisme, le gouvernement représentatif et l'empire de la loi étaient les seuls remèdes à cette désastreuse condition. Cependant, cela créait un autre problème, car alors que dans l'ordre traditionnel gouvernants et gouvernés partageaient un même univers de discours, avec la modernisation les nouvelles institutions représentatives de style européen se situaient bien loin du peuple¹⁰.

Kantorowicz eut un contact intense avec cette réalité au sein de laquelle il resta près d'un an, très lié à ces dirigeants modernisateurs. En Turquie il découvrit ou

⁶ Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Años interesantes. Una vida en el siglo XX* (Barcelona: Crítica, 2003), pp. 56, 58-9, 60, 61, 74 et, en général, chap. 4 et 5.

⁷ Maurizio Ghelardi, 'Dal mito all'immagine: Ernst Kantorowicz', dans: Ernst Kantorowicz, *Lo sovrannità dell'artista. Mito e immagine tra Medioevo e Rinascimento* (Venise: Marsilio, 1995), p. 218.

⁸ E. Grunewald, 18-26; Cecil H. Clough, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst H. 1895-1963', dans *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing*, dir. par Kelley Boyd (Londres: Fitzroy Dearborn Publs., 1999), I, p. 631; Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 153-4; Alain Boureau, *Histoires d'un historien. Kantorowicz* (Paris: Gallimard, 1990), pp. 51-72.

⁹ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 156.

¹⁰ Elie Kedourie, *Democracy and arab political culture* (Londres: Frank Cass, 1994), pp. 13-23.

renforça deux réalités par la suite déterminantes dans sa vie d'études: 1) l'Islam, qui lui donna la capacité d'étonnement suffisante pour comprendre ce qu'il observait et, 2) le patriotisme qui fut pour lui une façon d'affirmer son identité¹¹.

Ce patriotisme ne fut pas seulement une voie qui le convertit en l'un des porte-paroles du traditionnalisme germanique, même si c'était au prix de son infidélité à ses origines juives, il représenta aussi l'adhésion volontaire à une cause vitale. Pour défendre sa patrie et son patrimoine familial, il prit part à la répression de la révolte polonaise que la révolution bolchevique provoqua sur son lieu de naissance. Sont alors manifestes d'une part ce composant patriotique, fruit de l'assimilation prussienne et de la germanisation de son milieu culturel, et d'autre part le rejet d'une transformation radicale de son monde, son conservatisme politique et social qui se révèle de façon patente dans son action dans les corps francs qui tentèrent de s'opposer à l'incorporation de la Posnanie à la Pologne de Pilsudsky¹². En ce temps-là il avait déjà commencé ses études universitaires, la rupture avec sa prédestination familiale étant désormais décidée. C'est en 1918 que, revenu depuis peu de Turquie, il commence à se lier au monde des lettres. Il ne réussira pas dans son ambition et, début 1919 nous le retrouvons à Berlin, dans les *Freikorps* armés contre la révolte spartakiste menée par Rosa Luxembourg, luttant une fois de plus contre un monde nouveau qui se profile et qui provoque la transformation des sécurités traditionnelles. Rien d'étonnant par conséquent qu'on le trouve quelques semaines plus tard à Munich, où il fut de nouveau blessé en combattant la république des Conseils de Bavière¹³.

Cette crise des valeurs de la modernité européenne, faillite manifeste des certitudes en vigueur, mena à une extraordinaire floraison de réflexions, à la tentative d'obtenir une réponse en explication à l'apparente disparition de références. Pour Kantorowicz, comme le fait remarquer Boureau, l'histoire fut la planche de salut qui lui permit de reconstruire ses références personnelles et collectives.

b) 1919-1933/38

À Munich, il entre à l'Université Ludwig Maximilian, pour un semestre prévu pour les anciens combattants durant lequel il s'intéressera plus spécialement aux matières traitant d'économie. La médiation de son beau-frère, Arthur Salz (1881-1963), professeur d'économie dans cette université, influença considérablement son arrivée. C'est lui qui durant la guerre avait été en Turquie comme conseiller économique pour la reconstruction de l'Anatolie et qui avait appuyé son passage par ce pays. Il faudrait aussi lui attribuer de choix de matières d'économie une fois arrivé à Munich. Il est en outre probable que c'est Salz qui le présentera à Stefan George (1868-1933) qui, comme nous le verrons, allait être d'une importance transcendente dans sa vie. Il y a néanmoins des points obscurs, par exemple la divergence politique entre les deux hommes¹⁴.

En 1919 il déménage à Heidelberg pour des raisons qui ne sont pas du tout évidentes mais parmi lesquelles pèsent des questions comme la beauté et le prestige

¹¹ Marina Valensise, 'Storici e Storia. Ernst Kantorowicz', *Rivista Storica Italiana*, 101 (1989), p. 196.

¹² D. Matelski, 'Nationälitätenverhältnisse...', pp. 43-50.

¹³ E. Grunewald, 27-30; M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', p. 196; M. Ghelardi, 'Dall mito all'immagine', p. 218.

¹⁴ E. Grunewald, 31-3; A. Boureau, 61-2.

de la pittoresque Neckarstadt; l'éloignement de l'éprouvante vie urbaine; la réputation de certains de ses professeurs dans les disciplines qui l'intéressaient chaque fois plus; la présence attrayante de certains des disciples de George; et la soeur d'Ernst, Sophie, mariée au dit Arthur Salz, qui vivait alors à Heidelberg et de plus invitait parfois le poète chez lui¹⁵.

Il fit là-bas les séminaires qui lui restaient pour conclure sa carrière universitaire et commença –et termina– son doctorat. Fin et début d'une carrière universitaire qui allait durer jusqu'à sa mort, d'abord liée à Heidelberg même (1922-30), puis à Francfort, à partir de 1930¹⁶. Dans cet intervalle il devint l'un des historiens les plus célèbres d'Allemagne, comme nous le verrons, grâce à sa biographie de Frédéric II. Ce furent des années d'active participation au *Georgekreis* et d'une intense polémique historiographique.

Mais à partir de 1933, la situation de son pays connut un changement radical. Un témoignage lucide de l'époque, celui de Sebastian Haffner (1907-1999), décrit ainsi ce 30 janvier: 'Vers cinq heures arrivèrent les journaux du soir: 'Le cabinet de concentration nationale est constitué: Hitler est nommé chancelier du Reich''. Il ajoute: 'J'ignore quelle fut exactement la première réaction générale. La mienne fut la bonne durant une courte minute: un sursaut glacé. Bien sûr nous nous y attendions depuis longtemps. Il n'y avait plus d'autre solution'¹⁷.

L'arrivée récente des nazis au pouvoir affaiblit sa toute nouvelle position académique. Au bout de quelques semaines on commença à promulguer les premières mesures antisémites. Victor Klemperer (1881-1960) écrivait le 10 avril: 'Une personne avec vingt-cinq pour cent de sang non-aryen est 'étrangère à la race'. 'En cas de doute, c'est le spécialiste en recherche raciale qui décide'. Pureté de sang, comme dans l'Espagne du XVI^e siècle'¹⁸. Dans cette situation, Kantorowicz, prévoyant son expulsion de l'Université, envoya le 20 avril une lettre au ministre prussien de l'Instruction Publique. Il y manifestait sa douleur d'un rêve interrompu et son indignation devant l'ignominie antisémite: 'il me semblait que moi qui me suis engagé volontairement en août 1914, qui ai combattu, pendant et après la guerre contre les Polonais à Poznan, contre l'insurrection spartakiste à Berlin et contre la République des Conseils à Munich, je ne puisse m'attendre à être dépouillé de ma charge en raison de mon ascendance juive; il me semblait que par les écrits qu j'ai publiés sur l'empereur Frédéric II Hohenstaufen, je n'aurais pas besoin de garantie, ni passées, ni présentes, pour attester de mes sentiments en faveur d'une Allemagne réorientée dans un sens national; il me semblait que mon attitude fondamentalement enthousiaste envers un Reich dirigé en un sens national, allait bien au-delà de l'attitude commune, influencée par les événements, et ne soit pas effritée en raison de l'actualité récente... Pourtant, moi en tant que Juif, je suis contraint de tirer des conclusions nettes de ce qui arrive et de laisser de côté mes devoirs professionnels pour le semestre d'été'¹⁹.

¹⁵ E. Grunewald, 34-7; Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 157.

¹⁶ C.H. Clough, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst H. (1895-1963)', p. 632.

¹⁷ Sebastián Haffner, *Historia de un alemán. Memorias, 1914-1933* (Barcelona: Destino, 2002), p. 115. Édition originale: *Geschichte eines Deutschen: die Erinnerungen 1914-1933*, (Stuttgart: Dt. Verl.-Anst., 2000).

¹⁸ Victor Klemperer, *LTI. La lengua del Tercer Reich. Apuntes de un filólogo* (Barcelona: Minúscula, 2001), pp. 52-3. Édition originale: *LTI. Notizbuch eines Philologen* (Berlin : Aufbau-Verlag, 1947).

¹⁹ A. Boureau, 24-5.

Il est à noter que notre homme, en 1933, partageait le vocabulaire de ceux qui l'excluaient, cette *Lingua Tertii Imperii* qui montre, comme le signalait Victor Klemperer, que 'tout comme on parle du visage d'une époque ou d'un pays, l'expression d'une époque se définit aussi par son langage'²⁰. L'historien apparaissait comme un réactionnaire nationaliste que seul son judaïsme excluait, contre son gré, de la dérive nazie. C'était une ferme protestation contre l'idée qu'un juif allemand puisse être considéré comme un traître à cause de ses origines²¹. Klemperer lui-même indique qu'à la grande différence des persécutions contre les Juifs d'autres temps, les pogroms, celles effectuées par Hitler et son régime se basent précisément sur le sang: 'L'idée de race transpose la différence entre juifs et non-juifs au sang, rend impossible tout compromis, perpétue la séparation et la justifie comme désirée par Dieu'²².

En novembre 1933, le New College d'Oxford l'invita à passer un an comme Research Fellow en Angleterre, il accepta malgré le groupe d'étudiants qui était en train de se former autour de lui, en grande mesure à cause de l'ambiance créée par les jeunes sectateurs d'Hitler²³. A son retour, on racontait qu'on allait demander à tous les professeurs de jurer fidélité à Hitler, c'est pourquoi il présenta sa démission fin 1934. Malgré tout, il ne quitta pas l'Allemagne, même quand toutes les portes de retour à l'enseignement se fermèrent devant lui, après les lois de Nuremberg de 1935. Il pouvait encore faire de la recherche, il comptait sur ses possessions, et il entretenait un patriotisme acharné. De plus il avait encore des amitiés prussiennes loyales²⁴. Pendant cette période il voyagea à l'étranger, et travailla dans les principales bibliothèques européennes: Belgique, Pologne, Angleterre, Italie (Venise, Florence, Naples et Mantoue durant l'hiver 1937) et France. Cet exil intérieur berlinois -malgré les voyages- se termina en 1938, au mois de décembre, quelques jours avant la Nuit de Cristal²⁵. Il reçut alors la visite d'un ami d'Oxford, Cecil Maurice Bowra (1898-1971). Celui-ci lui fit voir le non-sens dans lequel il se trouvait et le risque d'une guerre imminente ou d'une exacerbation de l'antisémitisme. Convaincu, accompagné par Bowra, il quitta Berlin pour la frontière avec l'aide de plusieurs amis. C'était son adieu définitif à l'Allemagne, deuxième grande rupture de sa vie; cela avait été une période complexe, marquée par la défection de nombreuses amitiés et par la constatation que lui et le groupe de Stefan George avaient fourni des arguments à ceux qui défendaient les positions de tyrannie dans le nouvel Etat²⁶.

²⁰ Klemperer, 24.

²¹ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', pp. 208-9; texte recueilli par M. Ghelardi, 'Dal mito all'immagine', p. 222.

²² Klemperer, p. 199.

²³ Robert E. Lerner, 'Meritorious Academic Service': Kantorowicz and Frankfurt', et David Abulafia, 'Kantorowicz, Frederick II and England', tous deux dans *Ernst Kantorowicz: Erträge der Doppeltagung*, éd. de Robert Louis Benson et Johannes Fried (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997), pp. 29-32 et 126-143; spécialement, 138-43. Une référence littéraire dans le personnage de Berthold Opperman dans le roman de Lion Feuchtwanger (1884-1958), *Die Geschwister Opperman, Roman* (Amsterdam: Querido Verlag, 1933); *Les Opperman: roman* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1934).

²⁴ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 192-5.

²⁵ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', p. 209.

²⁶ E. Grünewald, 136-46; Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 192-5.

c) 1938-1963

La situation de professeur invité à Oxford grâce à Bowra n'était pas confortable. Pour la première fois il commença à avoir des problèmes économiques. Norman Cantor raconte que, dans cette situation, il vit dans le *Times* une petite annonce disant que l'Université de Californie à Berkeley cherchait un professeur associé d'histoire constitutionnelle anglaise médiévale. Bien qu'il ne sache rien de ce thème il sollicita la place et un disciple de Charles Haskins, administrateur, vit là l'occasion d'engager un élément controversé qui pourrait attirer des ressources à sa faculté. Une fois admis -raconte Norman Cantor avec dédain-, Kantorowicz se rendit à la librairie Blackwells et demanda le meilleur livre sur l'histoire constitutionnelle anglaise: il acheta les deux volumes de *History of English Law* de Frederick Pollock (1845-1937) et Frederick Maitland (1850-1906)²⁷. Avec ce bagage qu'il lut sur le bateau qui l'amena à New York, il se présenta à Los Angeles la première semaine de septembre 1939, alors que venait de commencer la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale²⁸.

Malkiel, par contre, indique qu'après un bref passage par Oxford, il déménagea à New York, point de rencontre de nombreux exilés européens. Il dut y apprendre à chercher du travail et des ressources. Le *Metropolitan Emergency Committee for Displaced Scholars* lui versa un modeste salaire annuel qui lui permit de passer une année de mise au point et de recherche à Johns Hopkins. Mais c'est avant cela qu'il trouva la place à Berkeley, où il arriva sans préparation, et cela parce que les relations avec ce pays étaient peu nombreuses. Même dans le cercle de George on regardait l'autre côté de l'Atlantique avec méfiance; de plus les intérêts académiques de chaque côté ne coïncidaient pas et sa préparation ne paraissait pas la meilleure pour Berkeley²⁹.

A partir de septembre 1939, il devint professeur de l'Université californienne, avec un poste fixe dès 1945³⁰. Ce furent des années particulièrement heureuses pour lui, très confortablement adapté à la vie universitaire nord-américaine. De fait, lorsqu'à la fin de la guerre l'Allemagne lui offrit la possibilité de rentrer, de récupérer sa chaire et de commencer une carrière d'honneurs, il refusa même s'il maintint des contacts avec ce pays, comme par exemple en 1955, année où il voyagea à Rome et où au cours d'un congrès il se réunit avec ses compagnons allemands³¹.

²⁷ Frederick Pollock and Frederic Maitland, *The History of the English Law before the Time of Edward I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895). Autres éditions de 1898 et 1923.

²⁸ F. Norman Cantor, 'The Nazi Twins. Percy Ernst Schramm and Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz', dans son *Inventing the Middle Ages. The Lives, Works, and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Quill William Morrow, 1991), pp. 97-9. Dans un livre récent, *Inventing Norman Cantor: Confessions of a Medievalist* (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), il amplifie le ton dédaigneux et despectif envers Kantorowicz et son cercle. Robert E. Lerner écarte la première de ces références pour être 'irresponsable misrepresentations' et considère que toute cette version est pure invention: 'This is all fabrication', et y oppose des preuves du contraire ('Kantorowicz and Continuity', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de R.L. Benson y J. Fried, pp. 110-2).

²⁹ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 200-2; Ralph E. Giesey, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz: Scholarly Triumphs and Academic Travails in Weimar Germany and the United States', *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 30 (1985), 191-202.

³⁰ C. H. Clough, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst H. (1895-1963)', p. 632.

³¹ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 202 et 212; Winfried Schulze, 'Refugee Historians and the German Historical Profession between 1950 and 1970', dans *An Interrupted Past. German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933*, éd. de Hartmut Lehmann et James J. Sheehan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 206-225.

Mais aux États-Unis aussi il eut des problèmes. A partir de 1949, en pleine ère McCarthy, l'Université commença à s'interroger sur la possibilité de demander aux professeurs un serment de loyauté anticommuniste. Kantorowicz rejeta totalement ce serment, le considérant comme une menace à la liberté académique et se justifia à travers une brochure qu'il édita à son compte (*The fundamental issue...*)³². Il y faisait valoir son passé anticommuniste prouvé dans les rues de Berlin en 1919. Il y disait aussi: 'La véritable question qui se pose est celle de la dignité humaine et professionnelle. Il existe trois professions autorisées à porter la robe: le juge, le prêtre et le professeur; cet attribut indique la maturité morale de celui qui la porte, son indépendance de jugement et sa responsabilité directe devant sa propre conscience et devant son Dieu. Cela signifie la souveraineté intérieure de ces trois professions' et donc, l'impossibilité de les exercer sous des pressions extérieures³³. Une composante de son exposé fut le rejet des ingérences externes à l'Université, dérivé du respect et de la dignité de la relative autonomie de la connaissance et de l'enseignement, une attitude respectueuse envers la cristallisation et la transmission de la connaissance où l'on pouvait voir, selon Malkiel, un écho ancestral du judaïsme, renforcé par l'héritage de l'idéalisme allemand. Pour les mêmes raisons, Kantorowicz rejetait les grèves sur le campus, parce qu'elles se faisaient au détriment de la connaissance³⁴.

Lui et l'institution furent aussi inflexibles l'un que l'autre. Son attitude 'fit de lui, du jour au lendemain, un héros dans des cercles qui n'auraient jamais envisagé la possibilité de jeter un coup d'oeil à ses ésotériques études académiques'³⁵.

En quittant Berkeley, il fut nommé Professeur invité à la Dumbarton Oaks Foundation, consacrée aux études sur Bysance, mais il repartit presque immédiatement pour l'Est et, entre 1951 et 1963, il fut professeur à l'École d'Études Historiques de l'Institut d'Études Avancées de Princeton. Cette institution, distincte de l'Université de Princeton, était dirigée par Robert Oppenheimer (1904-1967), qui avait été son collègue à Berkeley au début des années 40, et il avait comme directeur de la faculté de Sciences humaines son ami Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968)³⁶. Il se trouvait dans une zone riche en institutions académiques, près de New York, de ses musées et de ses bibliothèques.

La configuration d'un univers intellectuel

Comme pour une représentation multimédia, à la dimension biographique de notre personnage il faut en ajouter une autre, afin d'approfondir sa trajectoire. Cette deuxième dimension temporelle de la vie de Kantorowicz, dont je parlais au début, est intellectuelle.

L'Allemagne où il grandit, immédiatement avant la Ière Guerre Mondiale se trouvait prise dans une trame intellectuelle dominée par un idéalisme aux racines hegelienues. Cependant, et en partie comme réaction, durant les années actives

³² E. Grünwald, 116-8; C.H. Clough, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst H. (1895-1963)', p. 631.

³³ M. Ghelardi, 'Storici e Storia', p. 225.

³⁴ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 209-11; M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', pp. 210-1.

³⁵ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 210.

³⁶ N. Cantor, *Inventing Norman Cantor*, p. 65.

de la guerre, beaucoup de jeunes soldats et officiers allemands emmenèrent dans leur paquetage des volumes de poésie ésotérique pleine d'inspirations romantiques et symboliques. Beaucoup lurent les vers hellénisants du récemment découvert Hölderlin; d'autres se tournèrent vers les poètes modernes. A ceux qui cherchaient un style viril épuré, des manières monacales, un ton aristocratique et l'expression d'un signifié tangible et authentique dans leur vie, Stefan George offrait un profond défi et des réponses claires. Pour certains lecteurs, la doctrine qui irradiait de ses poèmes magiques était proche d'une certaine vision du monde imprégnée de religiosité³⁷. Cette référence reçut comme complément un aspect clé du développement intellectuel de notre historien: le patriotisme. Ferme patriote allemand, il souffrit sans doute une grande déception à la défaite des armées impériales en 1918, et lors des tentatives de changement social révolutionnaire dérivées de cette humiliante déroute militaire. Poznan, Berlin puis Munich constituèrent des épisodes qui menèrent beaucoup d'Allemands à basculer vers l'extrême droite, préparant le terrain pour le coup d'état avorté Hitler-Ludendorff en 1923. Le jeune Kantorowicz allait cohabiter inconsciemment avec des éléments parmi lesquels seraient recrutés les premiers nazis³⁸. La présence du cercle de George et le patriotisme devinrent un refuge face aux turbulences qu'il affronta d'abord par le biais du radicalisme, mais plus tard par celui de l'analyse historique. L'histoire se transforma en quelque sorte en un refuge pour lui.

De toute façon, cette situation n'influa pas réellement sur sa vie, car elle fut amplement rationalisée. Son passage par Munich lui laissa le contact avec Max Weber (1864-1920), dont les échos et la présence lui arrivèrent de façon claire. Un exemple en est la leçon prononcée par le sociologue devant le Syndicat d'Etudiants Libres en 1917, dans laquelle, en plus de rejeter les doctrines positivistes qui avaient réduit la vie et l'histoire, il réfutait les divers mouvements idéalistes qui avaient éclos en Allemagne durant ces années, en particulier ceux de Nietzsche et George. Ces romantismes intellectuels modernes de l'irrationnel, comme les appelait Weber, étaient cependant en train de parvenir à revitaliser les mythes, un mouvement qui était surtout né en réaction sentimentale à la turbulence des temps, mais était aussi le fruit de la mise en marche de nouvelles disciplines comme la psychologie, l'anthropologie ou la sociologie. Kantorowicz assista aussi à la deuxième leçon de Weber devant le dit syndicat, en 1919, au cours de laquelle fut approfondi ce qui avait déjà été dit³⁹.

³⁷ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 153. Il est significatif que celui qui décida Kantorowicz à quitter l'Allemagne en 1938, consacre une étude élogieuse à George dans *The Heritage of Symbolism* (ch. 4, pp. 98-143), le considérant comme un poète et un prophète national qui proclama les ambitions à demi cachées des Allemands. D'ailleurs, remarque-t-il, c'est le poète de l'Allemagne dans son époque tragique, celui qui proclame un nouvel ordre pour les soldats qui luttent au front.

³⁸ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 156; Krista Kesselring, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig (1895-1963)', dans *A Global Encyclopedia of Historical Writing*, éd. de D. R. Woolf, II (New York: Garland, 1998), p. 501.

³⁹ E. Grünwald, 31-3; Joseph Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', dans son *Mythistory, the making of a modern historiography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), pp. 190-2, 206. En plus de ce chapitre récent, cet auteur a traité le thème dans 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz: History as Mythenschau', *History of Political Thought*, 18/4 (1997), 579-603, et dans 'Mythenschau': Die Geschichtsphilosophie von Ernst H. Kantorowicz', dans *Geschichtskörper*, éd. de W. Ernst et C. Vismann, pp. 31-46. Je suis fondamentalement l'étude de 2003.

Cette renaissance du mythe s'inclutait dans une trajectoire personnelle chaque fois plus liée au cercle de George et au monde historique.

Dans le premier cas, la relation s'établit de façon continue avec son arrivée à Heidelberg, même s'il y eut des contacts antérieurs. Depuis la fin du XIXe, le poète Stefan George avait transformé son esthétisme initial en une attitude prophétique de poète-éducateur, se consacrant à tirer les masses de la décadence par la propagation de la beauté en toute chose (éthique, vie quotidienne, langue). Cette aspiration était accompagnée d'un patriotisme lyrique, orientation qui conduisit ses admirateurs aux tentations politiques les plus dangereuses. En 1891, il créa avec Hugo von Hofmannsthal, *Blätter für die Kunst*, l'organe d'expression d'un groupe fermé, uni par la vénération du maître, par un strict programme de travail et de lectures, et par une forte connivence de coutumes et de langage. C'est là qu'ils croisèrent des éléments comme l'influence du symbolisme français, les mouvements de jeunesse masculins, dérivés des mouvements scouts, des ligues gymnastiques et patriotiques du début de siècle qui entrèrent durant la république de Weimar dans la nébuleuse de l'extrême droite⁴⁰.

En tout cas, il se créa un groupe de jeunes qui, dans une époque d'inquiétude et d'insécurité, opprimés par le poids d'une guerre perdue, désorientés par l'arrivée de la démocratie politique, remplis d'espairs par l'existence de valeurs universitaires et confiants dans le rôle social et individuel de premier plan de la culture, se tournèrent vers le groupe de George, diffuseur d'un message poétique et surtout existentiel irrésistible pour beaucoup d'entre eux. D'inspiration nietzschéenne, c'était une doctrine positive, ouverte à la vie, pleine d'optimisme. Critique envers la modernité, le fonctionnalisme et le bureaucratisme, la doctrine de George voulait reconstruire l'intégrité spirituelle de l'individu grâce au retour au monde classique et à l'exaltation, au sens anti-scientifique, de la poésie. Ouvertement apolitique, sourde au progrès social, elle s'incarna dans les disciples du poète. Theodor Adorno abhorrait ce groupe et considérait que, dans son esthétisme, il mettait en scène une évidente volonté de domination. Il y voyait un prélude à la dictature politique. Groupe de pression, école de vie et de vérité, le cercle de Stefan George devait son influence au fait de représenter un lieu dans lequel on pouvait trouver «un contrepoint positif aux conditions désespérées de la civilité du progrès et du nihilisme intellectuel», comme disait Thomas Mann en 1921. Dans ce groupe se manifesta une profonde aspiration collective: la réconciliation de l'Allemagne avec sa propre histoire, fruit de la réaction contre la fragmentation du savoir et la spécialisation que critiquait en quelque sorte Weber, déjà cité, signe de l'affirmation de la culture positiviste et de sa propre crise. Allant au secours de la poésie face à la réputation croissante de la science, le cénacle de George recueillait l'exhortation de Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911) pour la refonte d'une science de l'esprit éloignée des sciences naturelles⁴¹.

Les dernières années du groupe furent conservatrices, en particulier pour son maître qui était passé de l'avant-garde au traditionnalisme, et qui fit, de fait, que beaucoup de ses admirateurs se consacrèrent à la philologie classique, à l'histoire

⁴⁰ E. Grünewald, 37-49, 56-90; A. Boureau, pp. 33-5; Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 154.

⁴¹ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', pp. 196-8.

et à l'archéologie⁴². Dans ce contexte, sa projection politique fut vers la droite conservatrice, car ce poète-aristocrate de l'élitisme rejetait la démocratie et le socialisme. Mais le conservatisme que George exigeait de ses disciples était unique et très différent des mouvements de droite réactionnaires. Ils exprimaient certaines attitudes particulières envers le passé; ils reflétaient de façon stylisée le charme de la vie rurale et de la croyance populaire; ils dédaignaient les cultures étrangères contemporaines, centrant leur enthousiasme sur la grande Allemagne. En plus de ces éléments qui faisaient clairement de lui un conservateur, il faut tenir compte du fait que George et son cercle ne furent pas patriotes —du moins jusqu'à 1920—, et rejetèrent le militarisme du Kaiser, l'impérialisme expansionniste et le capitalisme industriel, et que lui-même s'identifiait à une culture allemande médiévale et classique, pré-prussienne. En définitive, l'idéal de George était la terre mythique des Hohenstaufen⁴³.

Les nazis essayèrent de s'attirer George et son groupe, qui paraissait un secteur fanatique et, surtout, éloigné de la culture de Weimar. Joseph Goebbels —un de ses intégrants— lui offrit la présidence honoraire de la *Dichterakademie* d'Allemagne. Un autre secteur parmi les nazis ne lui faisait pas confiance à cause de sa proximité avec des intellectuels juifs. De leur côté, les membres du groupe de George restaient insensibles, au début des années trente, aux périls qui les entouraient. Le leader du groupe lui-même adopta une attitude ambiguë envers le nouveau régime. Il trouva un prétexte pour refuser la charge qu'on lui offrait, mais il accepta d'autres propositions. Il ne fut pas alarmé par l'arbitraire, la violence et la cruauté; il se réjouit de voir une partie de son programme et de sa rhétorique devenir réalité; il verrait la discrimination contre les juifs comme condamnable, mais, assurément, comme un sujet de moindre importance. En tout cas il faut souligner son manque de résistance, ainsi que l'indifférence et l'ingénuité de son attitude, si ce n'est sa stupidité et son opportunisme⁴⁴.

Une voie par laquelle ils s'opposèrent à la réalité fut par la création de ce qu'ils appelèrent le cercle secret, une forme de résistance contre la fin d'un monde, contre la décadence de l'histoire, désireuse de se sauver à travers le retour au mythe. Cette ontologie servit à recréer un univers imaginaire qui remplacerait la grandeur perdue et fournirait les instruments intellectuels pour dominer l'inéluctable. Avec ces présupposés ils s'interrogèrent sur la durée des empires et sur la permanence

⁴² Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 169-72. M. Bowra insiste sur cette proximité avec l'histoire de George, non comme historien mais comme quelqu'un qui croit que certaines choses sont permanentes dans la vie humaine, qui peuvent parfois s'obscurcir un certain temps mais qui peuvent ressurgir.

⁴³ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 177-8; David Abulafia, 'Kantorowicz and Frederick II', dans *Italy, Sicily and the Mediterranean, 1050-1400* (Londres: Variorum, 1987). Recueilli l'original publié dans *History*, 62 (1977), 193-210. Je cite les pages de ce dernier qui sont celles reproduites dans la compilation de ses articles), p. 195. Cette position de singularisation de George et, par extension, de Kantorowicz, contraste avec l'image clairement négative qu'offrent d'autres auteurs. Par exemple la référence au 'fantôme fasciste d'Ernst Kantorowicz' que réalise Alain Guerreau dans *L'Avenir d'un passé incertain. Quelle histoire du Moyen Âge au XXI^e siècle?* (Paris: Seuil, 2001), p. 113, critiquant le retour à des problèmes historiographiques 'paléolithiques' comme l'État et l'individu dans la récente historiographie médiévale; ou le 'rightist historian' et son 'fascist classic', dont par le Steven Rowan dans 'Comment: Otto Brunner', dans *Paths of Continuity. Central European Historiography from the 1930s to the 1950s*, éd. de Hartmut Lehmann et James van Horn Melton (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 296.

⁴⁴ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 196-8. M. Bowra considère que les nazis volèrent son vocabulaire et ses idées pour des fins qui n'étaient pas celles de George.

des régimes, comme moyen de restaurer l'unité d'un peuple face aux convulsions politiques, et enquêter sur le mystère de la fondation métaphysique du pouvoir, que tout, à ce moment-là, semblait nier⁴⁵.

L'attitude de Kantorowicz envers George et son cercle fut discrète, malgré sa loyauté envers lui, il resta à l'écart de nombreux conflits. C'est un tribut à son intelligence et une mesure de son habileté à voir les choses dans leur juste perspective, dit Malkiel⁴⁶. Quoi qu'il en soit, cette influence fut décisive pour le reste de sa vie, alors que son intérêt pour l'histoire était déjà manifeste. Il le fut de la même façon pour la plupart des jeunes intellectuels Allemands du moment, comme le reflète par exemple Sebastian Haffner qui se demandait au début des années vingt: 'Y avait-il encore quelque chose qui puisse nous enthousiasmer? (puisque l'enthousiasme est la source de vie des jeunes). Rien à part la contemplation de la beauté atemporelle, comme celle qu'irradiaient les poèmes de George et de Hofmannsthal'⁴⁷. L'influence de ce poète visionnaire fut considérable en partie parce qu'il interpelait un groupe d'élus auquel tous voulaient appartenir.

Dans le processus de récupération de l'Allemagne authentique, dans la création de *Das Neue Reich*, l'histoire glorieuse des temps où les idéaux de classicisme et la splendeur de son pays s'unirent, une époque mythifiée et mythique, joua un rôle déterminant. Kantorowicz lui-même, chaque fois plus intéressé par le monde antique et médiéval, se situait à une place bien en vue dans le cercle de George, spécialement intéressé par la période des Hohenstaufen. De plus, le cercle de George voyait dans la biographie des grands hommes des modèles pour la jeunesse de Weimar, à qui incombait la restauration des vieilles gloires de l'Allemagne⁴⁸. C'est pourquoi il est crucial de comprendre le contexte historiographique dans lequel le jeune Kantorowicz fit ses premiers pas. Le professeur qui l'influença le plus fut Alfred von Domaszewski (1856-1927), chercheur prolifique qui se consacra au monde classique, surtout à la période impériale de Rome⁴⁹; mais aussi à la religion, à l'organisation de l'armée, à l'histoire de l'art archéologique, à la relation entre histoire et littérature, et à l'intersection des études militaires et religieuses. En plus du lien établi entre les thèmes d'intérêt, il fut d'un grand bénéfice pour le jeune Kantorowicz dans le domaine de l'entraînement aux techniques d'analyse textuelle. Domaszewski se consacrait à l'analyse minutieuse des auteurs de *Historia Augusta* et de tous ses aspects (géographiques, toponymiques, etc.). Cette immersion, exemple de patience, lui fut bénéfique sur le plan de la technique⁵⁰.

Si, pour sa part, Eberhard Gothein (1853-1923) l'influença pour l'intégration d'illustrations et pour son lien avec l'Italie⁵¹, il reste à voir le facteur académique

⁴⁵ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', p. 199.

⁴⁶ 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 149.

⁴⁷ *Historia de un alemán*, p. 68.

⁴⁸ E. Grunewald, 149-57; J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', p. 193; D. Abulafia, 'Kantorowicz and Frederick II', p. 194; Otto Gerhard Oexle, 'Das Mittelalter als Waffe. Ernst H. Kantorowicz', 'Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite' in den politischen Kontroversen der Weimarer Republik', dans *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus. Studien zu Problemgeschichte der Moderne* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), pp. 163-215.

⁴⁹ *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1909); *Die Rangordnung der römischen Heeres* (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1908); *Des Religion des roemischen Heeres* (Lintz: Trier, 1895).

⁵⁰ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 160-1; J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', p. 213.

⁵¹ *Die Kulturentwicklung Süd-Italiens in Einzel-Darstellungen* (Breslau: Koebner, 1886). E. Grunewald, 49-53.

qui le mena vers sa grande oeuvre sur Frédéric II. Cette influence fut celle de Karl Hampe (1869-1936), dont la spécialité était la période finale des Hohenstaufen⁵². Il était particulièrement intéressé par l'entrecroisement dramatique des histoires allemande et italienne, et par le rôle qu'y joua Dante. Au début des années vingt, Hampe atteignit le zénith de son prestige, ce qui lui valut d'être nommé recteur de l'Université d'Heidelberg. Son discours d'acceptation porta sur la vision que la postérité offrit de l'empereur Frédéric II⁵³. L'apport de Hampe à Kantorowicz fut de susciter son intérêt pour une période de splendeur de l'histoire allemande; d'attirer son attention sur le concept d'empereur charismatique dans le cadre médiéval; de le conduire vers le dirigeant, l'académique et l'artiste, en tant que figure la plus brillante du Moyen Age allemand; et réserver un espace à Dante comme témoin de la légende qui entoura le monarque après sa mort⁵⁴. Tout cela en partant du fait qu'il était un historien général, et non un spécialiste en histoire des idées ou de la littérature. Enfin, auprès de Friedrich Baethgen (1890-1972), il est possible qu'il ait établi le lien avec les archives berlinoises et les *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*⁵⁵.

Dans ce contexte surgit le thème central de la trajectoire de Kantorowicz, le choix de Frédéric II comme sujet de recherche, qui lui permit d'entrer dans un thème attrayant en soi, de par les relations qu'il établissait entre les mondes germanique et italien, le contexte temporel, les protagonistes du drame, parce que c'était un thème qui avait attiré l'attention de gens tels que Dante à une époque, et George à la sienne; de plus le médiévisme européen, surtout allemand, avait montré son intérêt pour cette question, réclamant un approfondissement de son étude. En outre, ces thèmes étaient en relation avec la situation de sa propre époque, et attireraient sans aucun doute le jeune historien⁵⁶. De toute sa trajectoire professionnelle il n'abandonnerait jamais cet axe thématique puisqu'il situa au centre de sa recherche l'élucidation des idées qui de son temps furent merveilleuses, mais qui plus tard furent oubliées ou virent leur signifié s'obscurcir⁵⁷. Il étudia le mythe de Frédéric II à sa propre époque, mais aussi son applicabilité aux temps de la république de Weimar. C'est ainsi qu'on vit cette étude comme une prémonition, comme l'arrivée d'un modèle politique pour la complexe situation de son temps. C'était l'Allemagne secrète (*Das Geheime Deutschland*⁵⁸) qui idéalisait un modèle utopique

⁵² *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der zeit der Salier und Staufer* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1909), rééditions en 1912, 1923, 1929, 1943 et 1949; *Geschichte Konradins von Hohenstaufen* (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1894), réédité en 1942; *Urban IV und Manfred (1261-1264)* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1905); *Eine frühe Verknüpfung der Weissagung von Endkaiser mit Friedrich II und Konrad IV* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1917).

⁵³ *Kaiser Friedrich II. in der auffassung der nachwelt von Karl Hampe* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1925), réédité en 1943.

⁵⁴ Robert E. Lerner, "Meritorious Academic Service": Kantorowicz and Frankfurt', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de R.L. Benson, et J. Fried, pp. 17-18.

⁵⁵ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 162-3; J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', pp. 213-4.

⁵⁶ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 183-4; J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', p. 193; D. Abulafia, 'Kantorowicz and Frederick II', p. 197.

⁵⁷ C.H. Clough, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst H. (1895-1963)', p. 631.

⁵⁸ Ainsi s'intitulait la série de conférences qu'il prononça à l'Université de Francfort à partir de novembre 1933, avec l'opposition des jeunes SA présents dans la salle. Texte recueilli par Eckhart Grunewald dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de R. L. Benson et J. Fried, pp. 77-93. Il l'étudie dans ce même volume: "Übt an uns mord und reicher blüht wie blüht!". Ernst Kantorowicz spricht am 14. November 1933 über das 'Geheime Deutschland', pp. 57-76.

de nation, un mythe en définitive. C'était le mythe du véritable empire allemand qui récupérerait l'humanisme antique gréco-romain, ses références et sa capacité de rédemption. Bien reçu dans les cercles nazis, Himmler le lut, Goering l'offrit –dédiacé– à Mussolini, et Hitler le lut deux fois. Il ne faut pas s'étonner du fait qu'en 1962, lorsqu'un éditeur allemand lui proposa une réédition, il la refusa. Cependant, Kantorowicz, même s'il ne soutint pas les nazis, propagea des notions similaires aux leurs dans son livre. Les différences se fondaient sur le fait qu'il n'argumenta pas ses idées à partir de théories raciales ni ne partageait avec eux le concept de *volk*⁵⁹. Toutefois, sa position face aux nazis continua à soulever des polémiques longtemps après, comme celle qui s'est produite à partir de l'édition du livre de Cantor⁶⁰.

Le succès de son oeuvre se basait sur sa capacité à construire une synthèse attrayante d'histoire, de littérature, d'art et de religion. Ses tentatives d'ébaucher les origines et le développement des idées nécessitaient une recherche considérable qui incluait archéologie, histoire de l'art, numismatique, littérature, études juridiques et théologiques. Dans ce but il développa considérablement sa maîtrise des langues⁶¹.

Historiographiquement parlant, Kantorowicz se plaçait dans une tradition clairement innovatrice, qu'il conviendrait peut-être d'inclure dans la nouvelle histoire. D'ailleurs sa thèse, dirigée par Gothein (*Das Wesen der muslimischen Handwerkerverbände*, 1921), traitait du système des corporations d'artisans musulmans, un thème très influencé par son séjour en Turquie, et par son engagement envers l'économie (*Nationalökonomie*)⁶² qui se manifestait depuis quelques années. Il faut avoir présent à l'esprit que dans l'Allemagne des années vingt, l'économie semblait être, autant pour la droite que pour la gauche, le lieu de la rénovation. La vie politique nationale qui avait suivi l'abdication de l'empereur devait se remplir de contenus et l'économie apparut comme un élément d'union⁶³. De ce type d'impulsions était née, à la fin du XIXe siècle, la Nouvelle Ecole Historique d'Economie Nationale en Allemagne, représentée par Gustav Friedrich von Schmoller (1838-1917). Cette école formait un pont entre l'historicisme rankien classique et les nouveautés éconômistes du positivisme. Nationaliste et étatiste bien qu'on y apprécie l'impact marxiste, c'est d'elle que furent issues les premières grandes études empiriques sur les conditions de vie des ouvriers de l'industrie de l'époque, mais aussi des travaux méritoires sur l'artisanat au Moyen Age. Elle eut un côté pratique indéniable face au grave problème social du changement de siècle, pour lequel elle proposait un guide basé sur l'histoire nationale, et non sur des modèles théoriques,

⁵⁹ J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', pp. 195, 200, 207-11 et 222-3; D. Abulafia, 'Kantorowicz and Frederick II', pp. 201, 203; Robert E. Lerner, 'Ernst Kantorowicz and Theodor E. Mommsen', dans *An Interrupted Past*, éd. de H. Lehmann et J.J. Sheehan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 195.

⁶⁰ 'The Nazi Twins'. Compte rendu de Robert Bartlett, 'The Canterbury Tales', *The New York Review of Books* (14-V-1992), 12-15 et la réponse de R. L. Benson, R. E. Giesey et M.B. Sevcenko dans la même publication le 13-VIII-1992.

⁶¹ C. H. Clough, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst H. (1895-1963)', p. 631.

⁶² E. Grünwald, 54-56; Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 158; C.H. Clough, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst H. (1895-1963)', p. 631. De fait, Gothein avait publié, déjà en 1889, *Pforzheims vergangenheit. Ein beitrage zur deutschen städte- und gewerbe-geschichte* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot), dans une série dirigée par Gustav Schmoller, et continua ensuite à se consacrer à des questions d'histoire économique comme sa monumentale *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Schwarzwaldes und der angrenzenden Landschaften* (Strasbourg: K.J. Trübner, 1892) ou, en 1914, *Krieg und wirtschaft* (Heidelberg: Universität, 1914).

⁶³ A. Boureau, 63-4.

pour poser sa politique économique. Dans cette optique, ils persuadèrent Bismarck d'instituer le premier programme social de toutes les nations industrielles, comprenant des pensions pour maladie et retraite⁶⁴.

Felix Gilbert, dans ses mémoires, se souvient de l'impact du livre de Kantorowicz chez les jeunes étudiants: 'one admired his book for overcoming the rigidification that had set in medieval history because of an overemphasis on historical techniques'⁶⁵.

Faut-il pour autant parler de Kantorowicz comme d'un partisan de la nouvelle histoire? Si nous appliquons les critères qu'Ignacio Olábarri a établi pour cela⁶⁶, nous dirions que non car, en premier lieu, notre historien ne semble pas défendre une vision de l'histoire en tant que science au sens le plus radical du terme. Il serait plus proche des sciences de l'esprit, telles que les définit et défendit Dilthey, que des naturelles ou même des sociales, alors en cours d'apparition et de consolidation. En second lieu, il considère comme un trait déterminant l'interdisciplinarité, une relation permanente avec les autres sciences sociales, mais elle ne paraît pas non plus être autre chose que purement instrumentale, encore qu'il faudrait y mettre des nuances. Il ne semble pas non plus qu'il y ait en lui une volonté totalisatrice, intégratrice de la globalité des aspects de l'être humain, mais plutôt un souci de l'intégration de la plus grande quantité possible de perspectives autour d'un thème de fond illustré par une multitude de détails. D'autre part l'intérêt des nouvelles histoires pour les phénomènes collectifs cadre mal avec une oeuvre qui se consacre davantage à l'explication d'aspects plutôt liés aux élites, même si en fait elles ne sont pas analysées depuis une perspective traditionnelle événementielle, mais à travers la complexité des idées et les conceptions de fond. Même s'il existe chez Kantorowicz, en particulier dans son Frédéric II, une préoccupation intense pour le contemporain, et pour les similitudes qui pourraient être établies entre l'objet de sa préoccupation historique et la situation qu'il vit, nous ne pouvons parler de régularités, ni de lois, dans son travail historique. Même le relativisme moral et culturel si caractéristique des nouvelles histoires paraît se diluer sous l'influence de l'humanisme et la recherche d'un type idéal d'être humain, valable aussi bien aux confins du Moyen Âge qu'à l'époque moderne. Bien sûr on pourrait l'inclure, enfin, dans le caractère post-kantien des nouvelles histoires, c'est-à-dire dans l'idée que la connaissance 'constitue' la réalité qu'on étudie. D'une certaine manière, la connaissance mythique de la figure de Frédéric II constituait une réalité qui n'était pas celle qu'on acceptait traditionnellement. Mais il y a des traits qui distinguent clairement cette oeuvre de la tradition allemande antérieure, même si ce n'était peut-être pas aussi évident qu'avec ce qui se passait alors dans la France des *Annales*.

⁶⁴ Ernst Breisach, *Historiography. Ancient, Medieval and Modern* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), pp. 298-9.

⁶⁵ Felix Gilbert, *A European Past: Memoires, 1905-1945* (New York: Norton, 1988), pp. 106-7; cité par J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', p. 194 et par R.E. Lerner, 'Ernst Kantorowicz and Theodor E. Mommsen', p. 194. Voir aussi Jerzy Topolski, 'Das methodologisch Neue bei Ernst Kantorowicz', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de Jerzy Strzelczyk, pp. 121-30.

⁶⁶ Ignacio Olábarri, 'La 'Nueva Historia', una estructura de larga duración', dans *New History, Nouvelle Histoire: Hacia una nueva Historia*, éd. dir par J. Andrés Gallego (Madrid: Actas, 1993), pp. 29-81; 'New' new history: A *longue durée* structure', *History and Theory*, 34 (1995), 1-29.

De fait, les comptes rendus que fit Marc Bloch de son premier livre en 1928, 1932 et 1937, allèrent dans un sens positif croissant⁶⁷. Cette oeuvre avait une qualité innovatrice qui l'aurait rendue facile à assumer par les futurs *annalistes* de Strasbourg. Michael Bentley signale que *Les deux corps* peut se situer dans la même ligne que *Les rois taumaturges* de Bloch. Sa section sur 'la couronne comme fiction' va aussi loin dans sa composante imaginative que n'importe lequel des projets de Braudel à Paris⁶⁸. C'est pourquoi, bien qu'on ne doive parler de lui – en aucune sorte – comme d'un historien traditionnel, du moins tel qu'il se présente au public profane et académique après sa première oeuvre, ce fut ce facteur qui provoqua la polémique autour de sa première grande oeuvre, la biographie de Frédéric II (1927). Elle fut publiée sur l'intercession de George dans la collection *Blätter für die Kunst*, des éditions berlinoises Georg Bondi, auxquelles George en personne présenta l'original et paya de sa poche la moitié de la première édition : le succès du livre, dont la première édition, en mars 1927, fut de 2900 exemplaires, atteignit les 12800 exemplaires à la quatrième édition en 1936⁶⁹.

Frédéric II (1194-1250) incarne le fondateur de l'état laïc et représente une transformation capitale de l'histoire politique de l'occident chrétien du XIII^e siècle : la création d'un droit public de l'Etat qui combine l'héritage romain et la doctrine de l'Eglise : Dans la reconstruction de ces composantes, Kantorowicz offre la preuve de la thèse qu'ouvre la *Politische Theologie* de Carl Schmitt, selon laquelle les concepts les plus importants de la doctrine moderne de l'Etat ne sont autres que des concepts théologiques sécularisés. Avec ce livre, la mission du cénacle de Stefan George s'étendit à l'historiographie allemande. Une oeuvre grandiose par le dessin européen qu'elle laisse entrevoir et, en même temps, par la lacération de l'histoire nationale allemande qu'elle impose forcément. La vicissitude de Frédéric II contient le germe de l'histoire moderne de l'Europe. Son entreprise politique offre un modèle indispensable pour affirmer et consolider l'autonomie de l'autorité de l'Etat par rapport à l'Eglise, et définir la nature de la souveraineté et de la volonté législative contre le particularisme féodal⁷⁰.

L'impact de cette oeuvre fut énorme. Un jeune homme, sans autre oeuvre précédente, presque sans articles, qui livrait dans une luxueuse édition de 650 pages sans notes, bibliographie ni aucun appareil critique, dans un style orné, une interprétation intense et personnelle d'une figure de légende. Une deuxième édition parut en 1928, ouvrant la voie à ses traductions en italien et en anglais, et à une troi-

⁶⁷ Peter Schöttler, 'Marc Bloch as a critic of historiographical nationalism in the interwar years', dans *Writing National Histories. Western Europe since 1800*, éd. de Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan y Kevin Passmore (Londres: Routledge, 1999), p. 130 et, du même, 'Ernst Kantorowicz in Frankreich', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de R. L. Benson y J. Fried, pp. 144-161; 'L'érudition et après? Les historiens allemands avant et après 1945', *Genèses*, 5 (1991), 172-85.

⁶⁸ Bentley, Michael, 'Introduction: Approaches to modernity: Western historiography since the Enlightenment', dans *Companion to historiography*, éd. de Michael Bentley (Londres: Routledge, 1997), p. 478.

⁶⁹ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', p. 199.

⁷⁰ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', pp. 200-1; 203-4.

sième édition en 1931. Cependant, l'*establishment* académique flaira le défi et décida de lui infliger un châtement exemplaire⁷¹.

A sa parution s'engagea un fort débat entre ceux qui mettaient en valeur ses grandes vertus littéraires et ceux qui critiquaient son approche biaisée et peu académique d'un dirigeant controversé. Un de ses plus grands critiques fut Albert Brackmann (1871-1952)⁷², qui l'accusa d'être plus un mythographe qu'un historien. D'autres parlèrent de métahistoire⁷³ et il est évident que ce fut la *Historikerstreit* de l'Allemagne de Weimar. La controverse se centra sur la question de savoir si l'auteur avait mythifié l'histoire en vertu de règles politiques et poétiques, ou bien si la propre histoire était, en soi, mythologique : au fond, la polémique visait la vérité historique et ses conditions de possibilité⁷⁴. Brackmann écrivit à propos du livre : 'On ne peut écrire l'histoire ni comme disciple de George, ni comme catholique, ni comme protestant, ni comme marxiste, mais comme individu à la recherche de la vérité'⁷⁵. L'histoire traditionnelle défendait son statut face à une oeuvre qui menaçait sa prédomination. Le compte rendu le plus juste en le plus précis fut peut-être celui que fit Karl Hampe (1869-1936)⁷⁶. Il y mettait en valeur les trouvailles du livre, comme l'usage exhaustif de sources et l'utilisation de nouveaux angles de vision, mais critiquait les erreurs, la subjectivité, la pré-disposition favorable au personnage et à sa mythification, basée sur les sources légendaires construites à la même époque, le langage baroque, et ses prétentions littéraires et obscurantistes⁷⁷.

La réponse de Kantorowicz parut dans un article de 1930 ('Mytenschau'), dans lequel il insistait sur l'apologie de l'imagination créatrice qui, à la différence de ce que soutenaient ses adversaires, lui avait permis de restituer une vision du mythe et non une vision mythique, ce qui est plus proche de la vérité que le réalisme destructeur des dévots du fait pur et simple. Il considérait que les mythes n'étaient pas une forme de rhétorique, un mode de négation de la substance de la réalité historique, mais qu'ils constituaient une forme expressive imparable qui avait sa propre logique et pertinence pour la recherche historique⁷⁸. Mais il présenta la véritable

⁷¹ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 184-5; Jerzy Hauzinski, 'Friedrich II. von Hohenstaufen, der 'Endkaiser'', in der historiographischen Vision von Ernst Kantorowicz', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de Jerzy Strzelczyk, pp. 131-44; Eckhart Grünewald revoit les compte rendus qui parurent sur cette oeuvre dans "Not Only in Learned Circles: The Reception of *Frederick the Second* in Germany before the Second World War" dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de R. L. Benson y J. Fried, pp. 162-179.

⁷² L'année précédente, 1926, Albert Brackmann édita l'hommage à Paul Kehr : *Papsttum und kaisertum; forschungen zur politischen geschichte und geisteskultur des mittelalters Paul Kehr zum 65* (Munich: Verlag der Münchner Drucke).

⁷³ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 185. La polémique est recueillie dans *Stupor Mundi: zur Geschichte Friedrichs II von Hohenstaufen*, éd. de Gunter G. Wolf (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966). L'histoire dans l'Allemagne de cette période est analysée, entre autres, par Winfried Schulze, 'German Historiography from the 1930s to the 1950s', dans *Paths of Continuity*, éd. de H. Lehmann et J. von Horn Melton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp. 19-42 et Wolfgang J. Mommsen, 'German Historiography during the Weimar Republic and the Émigré Historians', dans *An Interrupted Past*, pp. 32-66.

⁷⁴ J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', pp. 193, 212-3; R. E. Lerner, 'Ernst Kantorowicz and Theodor E. Mommsen', pp. 189-95; D. Abulafia, 'Kantorowicz and Frederick II', p. 210.

⁷⁵ D. Abulafia, 'Kantorowicz and Frederick II', pp. 201-2.

⁷⁶ 'Das neueste Lebensbild Kaiser Friedrichs II', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 146 (1932), 441-75.

⁷⁷ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 187-192.

⁷⁸ M. Ghelardi, 'Dal mito all'immagine', p. 220; M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', pp. 206-7; D. Abulafia, 'Kantorowicz and Frederick II', p. 202.

apologie de son office d'historien en avril 1930, à l'occasion du XVII^e Congrès d'Historiens Allemands de Halle. Il y prononça une défense de l'inspiration subjective de son oeuvre et critiqua le positivisme qui se considérait capable de déterminer la méthode. Il reprit la distinction entre *Geschichtsforscher*, celui qui doit obéir aux règles communes de la recherche dans les sources et de la récolte de documentation, sans faire intervenir la partie philosophique, politique ou poétique de l'homme; et *Geschichtssreiber*, celui qui a besoin, pour son activité, non seulement de la vérité contemplative du pur érudit, mais aussi de la vérité de l'homme dans son intégrité. Il défendait le besoin d'une foi qui encourage la recherche, une foi dans le dogme tracé par la poésie, non dans la science, dans le futur de la nation et dans sa gloire. Cette réflexion recueillait la conviction que l'histoire avait pour unique objectif la recherche de la vérité, l'exercice de l'enseignement de la connaissance au service d'un idéal supérieur, l'identité de la nation au sein des institutions publiques qui leur assureraient la liberté et l'autonomie nécessaires. Il resta fidèle à cette conviction toute sa vie. Il fallait décrire non seulement ce qui avait été, mais encore, surtout, comment cela avait été perçu. D'où son insistance sur la nécessité des mythes⁷⁹.

En plus de ces interventions, il publia un second volume, *Ergänzungsband* (1931), dans lequel il réunit les preuves documentaires utilisées dans le premier. Cependant le problème ne fut pas résolu, vu que le fond de la question, la mythification ou la valorisation positive de la subjectivité dans l'analyse du personnage historique, ne varia pas d'un iota avec l'apport du matériel qui avait servi pour élaborer cette perspective. Cependant cette deuxième partie inaugura la transformation de Kantorowicz de littérateur en historien, et servit en quelque sorte pour, en dépit des critiques, rendre plus acceptable sa mise en oeuvre théorique et sa manière d'écrire l'histoire. De fait, les répercussions de son Frédéric II lui ouvrirent les portes de l'Université, et en 1930 on lui offrit -et il accepta- une place de *Honorary professor* à Francfort, qui devint poste fixe en 1932⁸⁰.

Après cela il faut passer à sa vie académique dans le nouvel environnement nord-américain. L'arrivée dans une culture inconnue ou peu familière et l'adoption forcée d'un nouveau véhicule de communication, imparfaitement contrôlé au début, peut avoir un effet cathartique et purificateur sur un certain type d'humanistes à forte volonté. Ce fut ce qui arriva à Kantorowicz. Son intégration fut complète, parallèle à sa reconnaissance pour l'accueil qui lui fut fait, sans pour autant annuler les points de vue critiques⁸¹.

⁷⁹ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', pp. 206-8; M. Ghelardi, 'Dal mito all'immagine', p. 221; J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', p. 210; E. Grünwald, pp. 90-101; et 'Sanctus amor patriae dat animum — ein Wahlspruch des George-Kreis? Ernst Kantorowicz auf dem Historikertag zu Halle a.d. Saale in Jahre 1930', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 50 (1994), 89-125.

⁸⁰ Sur son arrivée à l'Université de Francfort, voir R.L. Lerner, 'Meritorious Academic Service', pp. 14-32; E. Grünwald, pp. 101-13, 118-35.

⁸¹ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 202-3. Sur l'émigration et l'accueil nord-américain, voir Catherine Epstein, 'Schicksalsgeschichte: Refugee Historians in the United States'; et Karen J. Greenberg, 'Uphill Work': The German Refugee Historians and American Institutions of Higher Learning', toutes deux dans *An Interrupted Past*, pp. 116-35 et 94-101. Lion Feuchtwanger recueillait dans son roman le cas d'un des frères Oppermann, Edgar, médecin et chercheur, à qui on fit 'd'honnêtes propositions de Londres, de Paris, de la majorité des instituts médicaux du monde civilisé qui s'intéresse au créateur du procédé Opperman' (les citations appartiennent à l'édition espagnole, Madrid : Alianza, 2002, p. 269); ou d'un ami de Gustav, autre frère (p. 290). En dernier lieu, l'auteur —juif et obligé à l'exil— signale, 'ils expulsèrent du pays les plus doués ou bien les enfermèrent pour mettre à leur place leurs sectateurs ineptes' (pp. 353-4).

En arrivant à Berkeley il tomba sur Max Radin (1880-1950), né à Poznan et émigré aux États-Unis à l'âge de quatre ans. Il y avait beaucoup de coïncidences entre eux deux, comme l'intérêt pour l'antiquité et la religion. Pendant ces années californiennes, il développa une active participation à des séminaires mensuels dont il devint un phare, et qui étaient fréquentés par de nombreux anciens émigrés. L'un de ces derniers, le musicologue allemand Manfred Bukofzer (1910-1955), allait collaborer avec Kantorowicz dans *Laudes regiae*, l'étude musicologique des acclamations royales et religieuses incluse dans le plan de travail qui allait occuper le reste de sa vie. Dans cette ambiance, le nombre de ses publications augmenta considérablement. Leurs thèmes étaient très variés, mais il en ressortait toujours celui de la projection iconographique du cosmos conceptuel médiéval⁸².

Laudes regiae (1946), en plus d'être un prémice de ce qu'allait être *Les deux corps du roi*, est une étude qui parcourt diverses époques et thèmes centrés sur les acclamations liturgiques, en particulier 'Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat', et la souveraineté médiévale, avec une attention spéciale pour la France carolingienne. Pratiquement prêt en 1941 —même si en fait il était très avancé lorsqu'il quitta l'Allemagne en 1938—, cet ouvrage montre comment Kantorowicz élargissait son intérêt vers le monde bysantin et vers l'Angleterre. De nombreux traits unissaient cette oeuvre avec sa première publication, surtout l'intérêt pour le cérémonial⁸³. Pour Ghelardi, cette oeuvre constitue l'axe entre les deux parties fondamentales de sa trajectoire intellectuelle. Cette étude ne se réfère pas seulement aux origines de l'Etat moderne européen considéré à la lumière du concept de transcendance, mais aussi, surtout, au point d'arrivée sur le caractère sacré immanent et sur la figure de l'artiste comme demiurge, terrain qu'il développera en arrivant à Princeton, à partir de 1951⁸⁴.

Déjà, à Berkeley, il put créer un cercle d'étudiants parmi lesquels on remarquait Robert L. Benson (1925-1996)⁸⁵. Malkiel parle de ce groupe de supporteurs à Berkeley⁸⁶, beaucoup d'entre eux produisirent des thèses doctorales et par la suite devinrent professeurs, comme Ralph E. Giesey⁸⁷, William M. Bowsky⁸⁸, William A.

⁸² Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 204-8 et voir l'appendice bibliographique. Il est notable que 90% de ses articles correspondent à sa période américaine, et parmi eux, 14 à l'étape californienne, et 22 à celle de Princeton, bien que cette division se révèle un peu superficielle.

⁸³ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 216; Sebastian Klotz, 'Herrscherakklamation und serielle Musik. Zur Studie über die laudes regiae von Ernst H. Kantorowicz und Manfred F. Bukofzer, Berkeley 1946', dans *Geschichtskörpe*, 161-170.

⁸⁴ M. Ghelardi, 'Dal mito all'immagine', p. 217.

⁸⁵ *The bishop-elect. A study in medieval ecclesiastical office* (Princeton N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1968); avec Giles Constable (eds.), *Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century*, éd. de Giles Constable (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982).

⁸⁶ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', p. 203.

⁸⁷ *Cérémonial et puissance souveraine: France, XVe-XVIIe siècles* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1987); *If not, not: the oath of the Aragonese and the legendary laws of Sobrarbe* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1968); *The juristic basis of dynastic right to the French throne* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1961); *The royal funeral ceremony in Renaissance France* (Genève: E. Droz, 1960) basé sur sa thèse doctorale, University of California, 1954.

⁸⁸ *Henry VII in Italy. The conflict of empire and city-state, 1310-1313* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1960; réimprimé à Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1974).

Chaney (1922-)⁸⁹ et Thomas N. Bisson⁹⁰. A ceux-là s'ajouteraient d'autres encore, résultat de son étape postérieure, comme Sarah Hanley (1937-)⁹¹; Richard A. Jackson (1937-)⁹² ou Lawrence McBride Bryant⁹³.

Lors de sa deuxième étape aux États-Unis, à Princeton, il fit un grand travail de recherche, à caractère monographique, très annoté et difficile. C'est là qu'il entra en contact avec Theodor Ernst Mommsen (1905-1958; petit fils de l'historien de Rome et neveu du sociologue Max Weber), exilé d'Allemagne plus pour son anti nazisme que pour toute autre raison, et avec Elmore Harris Harbison (1907-1964). Sur son chemin se trouvait aussi l'historien de l'art Kurt Weitzmann (1904-1993)⁹⁴. Il n'y a pas dans cette période de livres de cours, ni de haute vulgarisation, ni de synthèses vite faites ou du même genre. En fait, *Les deux corps* était prêt en 1950, mais il continua à y travailler durant sept autres années. Cette recherche a d'amples contacts avec d'autres disciplines ainsi qu'une approche inductive. Mais on ne peut écarter l'excessive minutie qui l'amena à étendre aux dimensions de *Les deux corps* ce qui n'était qu'un article⁹⁵. En tout cas, il s'agit d'un travail historiographique d'une profondeur considérable, beaucoup moins engagé dans son contexte contemporain, même s'il reste au fond beaucoup des problèmes intellectuels qui caractérisèrent le précédent.

C'est son livre le plus connu, un riche mélange de sources d'archives artistiques, littéraires et juridiques pour une étude complexe et parfois ésotérique des idées et des symboles de la royauté médiévale. Il produisit un fort impact parmi les études sur la pensée politique des derniers siècles médiévaux et du commencement de l'ère moderne⁹⁶. C'est un livre extrêmement complexe, impossible à réduire à une simple formule, mais peut-être son sous-titre y aide-t-il: *Essai sur la théologie politique au Moyen âge*. Malkiel dégage de ce livre deux aspects: d'un côté son attention pour le cas anglais, à travers laquelle il montrait sa reconnaissance envers les pays anglo-saxons qui l'avaient accueillis; de l'autre la présence de Dante, très lié à Frédéric

⁸⁹ *The cult of kingship in Anglo-Saxon England. The transition from paganism to Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970).

⁹⁰ *Assemblies and representation in Languedoc in the thirteenth century* (Princeton N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1964); *Medieval representative institutions, their origins and nature* (Hinsdale, Ill., Dryden Press, 1973); *Conservation of coinage: monetary exploitation and its restraint in France, Catalonia, and Aragon (c. A.D. 1000-c. 1225)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979); *Cultures of power: lordship, status, and process in twelfth-century Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).

⁹¹ *The lit de justice of the kings of France: constitutional ideology in legend, ritual, and discourse* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1983).

⁹² *Vive le roi!: a history of the French coronation from Charles V to Charles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); *Ordines coronationis Franciae: texts and ordines for the coronation of Frankish and French kings and queens in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995-2000); *European monarchy: its evolution and practice from Roman antiquity to modern times*, éd. de Heinz Duchhardt et David Sturdy (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1992).

⁹³ *The king and the city in the Parisian royal entry ceremony: politics, ritual, and art in the Renaissance* (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1986).

⁹⁴ N. Cantor, pp. 38-9, 54, 67; R.E. Lerner, 'Ernst Kantorowicz and Theodor E. Mommsen'.

⁹⁵ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 213-15; J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', pp. 215-221; R.E. Lerner, 'Ernst Kantorowicz and Theodor E. Mommsen', pp. 196-200.

⁹⁶ K. Kesselring, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig (1895-1963)', p. 502; Carl Landauer, 'The King's Two Bodies and Kantorowicz's Constitutional Narrative', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de R.L. Benson et J. Fried, pp. 211-223.

II, revendiquant par là la continuité de son engagement intellectuel⁹⁷. C'est une étude de la théologie politique médiévale qui a pour thème central la relation entre l'idée abstraite de pouvoir et son représentant concret. Kantorowicz affronta dans ce livre la façon dont, aux origines de la doctrine moderne des Etats, la pensée juridique et politique du Moyen Age tardif conçut l'immortalité de la monarchie au-delà de la personne mortelle qui l'incarnait. Ce problème, capital dans l'histoire politique occidentale, tournait autour du passage d'une conception de l'autorité incarnée par son titulaire visible à une idée du pouvoir impersonnel, où celui qui le détenait temporairement y accédait en vertu d'une délégation collective. D'un individu qui représentait un être collectif —personne réelle qui incarnait une abstraction— la souveraineté passait à un être collectif représentatif —c'est-à-dire une abstraction qui symbolise des êtres réels—⁹⁸. Cette théorie résout le problème de la légitimité politique en localisant l'autorité dans une fiction des deux corps du roi: le corps naturel qui est mortel, et le corps politique qui n'est pas sujet à la mort⁹⁹.

Cantor commente dans ses mémoires le compte rendu qu'il en fit. Il souligne que, du point de vue de l'histoire politique et légale, il eut peu de conséquences. C'était une exposition des croisements structurels du discours médiéval. En ce sens, ce fut une oeuvre pionnière de grande valeur, bien qu'irrégulièrement construite et difficile à lire, dans laquelle Kantorowicz, selon Cantor, était très marqué par son ignorance des sciences sociales et du comportement, et par son effort pour plaire aux pontes de la *Medieval Academy*. Cependant, signalait le même Cantor, lire son livre anticipait le déconstructionnisme moderne¹⁰⁰. D'une certaine manière, nous pourrions parler d'un post-moderne *avant la lettre*, de par son intérêt pour les représentations, dans le domaine littéraire, dans la construction de la réalité. De là pourrait venir aussi, sa pertinence actuelle et le respect qu'on lui porte dans certains secteurs. D'ailleurs le début de son sauvetage vint de Michel Foucault qui le reprend dans *L'archéologie du savoir* (1969) et dans *Surveiller et punir* (1975)¹⁰¹. Pour Joseph Mali, Kantorowicz voulait créer une nouvelle historiographie plus utile comme l'avait demandée Nietzsche et selon les mêmes termes. Plus artistique que scientifique, plus subjective qu'objective, plus consciente du rôle du mythe dans l'historiographie; superhistorique en définitive, selon la terminologie et l'esthétique nietzschéenne, si influente dans la pensée allemande du début du XXe siècle et si décisive comme référence pour le postmodernisme de la fin de ce siècle. Comme Nietzsche, Kantorowicz considérait que l'histoire était essentiellement un art et non une science, et appartenait et devait être pratiquée comme littérature nationale¹⁰².

⁹⁷ Yakov Malkiel, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz', pp. 217-8.

⁹⁸ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', pp. 211-2.

⁹⁹ C.H. Clough, 'Kantorowicz, Ernst H.', p. 631.

¹⁰⁰ N. Cantor, p. 70.

¹⁰¹ Gabrielle Spiegel parle de la 'tendency so brilliantly traced by Kantorowicz of the spiritualization and sanctification of the secular state in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries' dans *The Past as Text. The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), p. 160; Johannes Fried, 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz and postwar historiography', p. 197; Wolfgang Ernst, 'Kantorowicz; New historicism avant la lettre?', dans *Geschichtskörper*, pp. 187-205.

¹⁰² J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', pp. 204, 208; pour le rôle de Nietzsche, pp. 204-7; aussi Otto Gerhard Oexle, 'German Malaise of Modernity: Ernst H. Kantorowicz and his 'Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite'', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de R.L. Benson y J. Fried, pp. 42-5.

De plus, le succès de ce livre dans les années quatre-vingt pourrait être dû à la résurgence de l'histoire politique, du droit et de sa mystérieuse autonomie, qui informe le social au lieu de le refléter, et que la crise de la culture marxiste et du modèle communiste ont rendu encore plus manifeste. Au fond il traite des origines chrétiennes de la représentation moderne du pouvoir. Et on remarquerait sa connexion avec le concept de culture politique développé depuis la politologie, un des thèmes les plus importants de la renaissance de l'histoire politique durant les années susdites¹⁰³.

* * *

En 1987, Alan Megill tentait d'évaluer l'impact de l'oeuvre de Michel Foucault dans l'historiographie. Pour cela il utilisait comme indicateur le nombre de références à ses oeuvres dans diverses bases de données¹⁰⁴. De même, bien qu'à une échelle plus modeste, j'ai voulu en faire autant et, à partir des données du *Social Sciences Citation Index*, j'ai élaboré le présent tableau de références à l'oeuvre de Kantorowicz:

1981-1985	56	1994	9
1986	22	1995	15
1987	17	1996	6
1988	15	1997	23
1989	10	1998	15
1990	15	1999	13
1991	14	2000	15
1992	15	2001	13
1993	18		

Comme on peut le voir, il reste un auteur d'actualité et, comme je le disais plus haut, un auteur qui forgea des concepts et des expressions dont l'utilité est toujours en vigueur de nos jours. Au-delà de sa propre oeuvre, il faudrait mettre en avant, comme le fait Johannes Fried, l'appréciation différente de l'Allemagne de Weimar par rapport à l'époque nazie, un intérêt spécial pour la biographie et l'émigration, un intérêt croissant pour la réflexion philosophique, et enfin la croissan-

¹⁰³ M. Valensise, 'Storici e Storia', pp. 212-3; J. Mali, 'Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology', p. 226; M. A. Ruehl, 'In This Time Without Emperors': The Politics of Ernst Kantorowicz's Kaiser Friedrich Der Zweite Reconsidered', *Journal- Warburg And Courtauld Institutes*, 63 (2000), 187-242; Francisco Javier Caspistegui, 'Political history in the 20th Century: from ostracism to cultural turn', dans *The Strenght of History at the Doors of the New Millenium. History and the other Social and Human Sciences along XXth Century (1899-2002)*, éd. de Ignacio Olabarri et F. J. Caspistegui (Pamplona: EUNSA, 2004) et 'La llegada del concepto de cultura política a la historiografía española', dans *Usos de la historia y políticas de la memoria*, éd. de Carlos Forcadell et al. (Saragosse: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2004), pp. 167-85.

¹⁰⁴ 'The Reception of Foucault by Historians', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XLVIII (1987), 117-141. Johannes Fried fait quelque chose de similaire dans son article 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz and postwar historiography. German and European perspectives', dans *Ernst Kantorowicz*, pp. 180-201, qui dégage trois étapes dans la connaissance de l'oeuvre de Kantorowicz: juste après la 2^e Guerre Mondiale, après la mort de l'auteur, et de nos jours.

ce de la recherche historiographique en général, mais en Allemagne en particulier¹⁰⁵. Preuve en furent les actes académiques célébrés pour commémorer le centenaire de sa naissance, donnant lieu à des études sur sa vie et son oeuvre¹⁰⁶, et à une réédition et réinterprétation de ses livres, surtout le plus connu, *Les deux corps du roi*. Précisément dans le compte rendu d'une de ces rééditions, était signalée la continuité de l'enthousiasme envers cette oeuvre au fil des décennies¹⁰⁷.

Un autre signe de son succès est ce qui se rapporte à l'utilisation de la paraphrase du titre de son dernier livre comme recours littéraire et comme façon de distinguer une réalité tangible et une réalité symbolique. C'est ce qu'a fait Natalie Zemon Davis: 'I want to consider how historians have conceptualized the body of historical knowledge and have placed their own life's work within it'¹⁰⁸.

En définitive, nous sommes en présence d'un classique dont les apports ne se périment pas, même si la recherche avance de manière plus que considérable, et même si les controverses secouent le contexte dans lequel se réalisa son travail.

Chronologie

- 1895. Il né à Poznan.
- 1914. Il s'engage dans l'armée allemande. Il est blessé à Verdun.
- 1918. Il combat contre l'intégration de Poznan en la Pologne; face aux spartakistes à Berlin et contre la République des Conseils à Munich, où il est blessé.
- 1919. Déménagement à Heidelberg.
- 1921. Il obtient le doctorat à Heidelberg.
- 1922. Maître de conférences à Heidelberg.
- 1927. Il publie sa biographie de Frédéric II.
- 1930. Maître de conférences à Frankfurt.
- 1933. Lettre de protestation al Ministre Prussien d'Instruction Publique.
- 1933. Research Fellow au New College d'Oxford.
- 1934. Il présente sa démission.
- 1938. Il quitte l'Allemagne vers l'Angleterre.
- 1939. Il part vers aux EE.UU. Il se demeure à Berkeley.
- 1950. Il quitte l'Université de la Californie (Berkeley), à cause de ne pas signer le serment de loyauté.
- 1951. Professeur visiteur à la Dumbarton Oaks Foundation.
- 1951. Professeur de l'École d'Études Historiques de l'Institut d'Études Avancées (Princeton).
- 1957. Il publie son ouvrage le plus connu: *Les deux corps du roi*.
- 1963. Il décède à Princeton.

¹⁰⁵ 'Ernst H. Kantorowicz and postwar historiography', pp. 196-201.

¹⁰⁶ *Geschichtskörper*, éd. de W. Ernst et C. Vismann; *Ernst Kantorowicz (1895-1963)*, éd. de J. Strzelczyk; et *Ernst Kantorowicz*, éd. de R. L. Benson et J. Fried.

¹⁰⁷ John E. Weakland dans *The European Legacy*, 5/5 (2000), 766-8; la réinterprétation dans Andrea Galatello Adamo, *Di cosa parla The king's two bodies?, una dislettura* (Torino: G. Giappichelli, 1996).

¹⁰⁸ 'History's Two Bodies', *American Historical Review*, 93/1 (1988), 1-30. Un autre exemple, du point de vue du Droit cette fois, G. Teubner, 'The Kings Many Bodies. The Self-Deconstruction of Laws Hierarchy', *Law & Society Review*, 31/4 (1997) 763-87.

Bibliographie

1. Livres

Das Wesen der muslimischen Handwerkerverbände (Original dactylographié de sa thèse doctorale, Heidelberg, 1921). Extrait dans *Jahrbuch der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Heidelberg*, 2 (1921/22), 182-3.

a) Frédéric II

Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite, 2 vols (Berlin: Georg Bondi, 1927 et 1931). Autres éditions: 2^e (1928); 3^e (Berlin, Leipzig: Hesses und Becker, 1931); 4^e (Berlin: Georg Bondi, 1936), Série: Werke aus dem Kreis der Blätter für die Kunst. Geschichtliche Reihe; (Dusseldorf & Munich: Helmut Kupper, 1973); (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1963, 1980, 1987).

Frederick the Second, 1194-1250, trad. par Emily Overend Lorimer (Londres: Constable & co. Ltd., 1931; New York: R. R. Smith inc., 1931; New York: F. Ungar Pub. Co., 1957 et 1967).

Federico II. Imperatore, trad. par Gianni Pilone Colombo (Milano: Garzanti, 1976; rééd. en 1988; 3^e éd. 2000). La première traduction italienne est de Maria Offergeld Merlo à partir de celle de 1931 (Milano: Garzanti, 1939).

L'Empereur Frédéric II, trad. par Albert Kohn (Paris: Gallimard, 1987).

b) Les deux corps

The King's two bodies, a study in Mediaeval Political Theology (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957; 6^e, 1981; réimpr. 1985); avec préf. de William Chester Jordan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997 et 1998).

Los dos cuerpos del rey, un estudio de teología política medieval, trad. par Susana Aikin et Rafael Blázquez (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1985).

I due corpi del re: l'idea di regalità nella teologia politica medievale, trad. par Giovanni Rizzoni, introd. de Alain Boureau (Torino: Einaudi, 1989).

Les Deux corps du roi: essai sur la théologie politique au Moyen âge, trad. de l'anglais par Jean-Philippe Genet et Nicole Genet (Paris: Gallimard, 1989).

Die zwei Körper des Königs: eine Studie zur politischen Theologie des Mittelalters, trad. par Walter Theimer (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1992).

c) Autres livres

Laudes regiae; a study in liturgical acclamations and mediaeval ruler worship, avec une étude des laudes et transcriptions musicales par Manfred F. Bukofzer (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1946); 2^e éd. (1958). L'étude 'The music of the laudes' de Bukofzer, pp. 188-221, a été imprimé la même année en tirage à part.

La sovranità dell'artista, mito e immagine tra Medioevo e Rinascimento, éd. de Maurizio Ghelardi, trad. par Michele Bacci, prés. de Ralph E. Giesey (Venezia: Marsilio, 1995). C'est une compilation d'articles qui inclut les suivants: 8, 12, 19, 32, 35, 37, 38.

Oeuvres. Histoires d'un historien, Kantorowicz, par Alain Boureau (Paris: Gallimard, 2000) Inclut: 'Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite'; 'The king's two bodies, a study in medieval political theology'. Autre édition: (Paris: Le Grand livre du mois, 2000). Postface d'Alain Boureau 'Histoires d'un historien, Kantorowicz'.

Mourir pour la patrie: et autres textes, trad. par Laurent Mayali et Anton Schütz, prés. de Pierre Legendre (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1984). Rassemble les textes n. 16, 18, 27 et 37.

Selected studies (Locust Valley-N.Y.: J. J. Augustin, 1965). Inclut les articles n. 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37 et 38.

Götter in Uniform: Studien zur Entwicklung des abendländischen Königtums, ed. par Ernst Kantorowicz et Eckhart Grünewald (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1998).
Erträge der Doppeltagung, éd. par Robert L. Benson et Johannes Fried (Princeton: Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität; Frankfurt: Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1997).
Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz: Geschichtsschreiber (Wien: Turia und Kant, 1991). Sélections.
The Fundamental Issue: Documents and Marginal Notes on the University of California Loyalty Oath (San Francisco: Parker Printing, 1950).

2. Articles

1. 'Mythenschau. Eine Erwiderung', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 141 (1930), 457-471.
2. 'Deutsches Papsttum', dans *Vom Schicksal des deutschen Geistes* (Berlin: Verlag Die Runde, 1935), 42-57.
3. 'Die Wiederkehr gelehrter Anachorese im Mittelalter', Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1937.13 pp. dans *Selected studies*, pp. 339-351.
4. 'Petrus de Vineia in England', *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschungen*, 51 (1937), 43-88; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 213-246.
5. 'The Este Portrait by Roger van der Weyden', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtland Institutes*, 3 (1939-1940), 165-180; dans *Selected Studies*, pp. 366-80.
6. 'A Norman Finale of the Exultet and the Rite of Sarum', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 34 (1941), 129-143.
7. 'An Autobiography of Guido Faba', *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, 1/2 (1941-1943), 253-280; dans *Selected Studies*, pp. 194-212.
8. 'Ivories and litanies', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtland Institutes*, 5 (1942), 56-81; 'Avori e canti liturgici', dans *La sovranità dell'artista*, pp. 181-214.
9. 'Plato in the Middle Ages', *The Philosophical Review*, 51 (1942) 312-323. C'est une détaillée compte rendu de Raymund Klibansky, *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages* (Londres: The Warburg institute, 1939) et *Plato Latinus, I: Meno interprete Henrico Aristippo*, éd. de Victor Kordeuter (Londres: The Warburg institute, 1940).
10. 'A diplomatic mission of Francis Accursius and his oration before pope Nicholas III', *The English Historical Review*, 58 (1943), 424-447 (avec George L. Haskins).
11. 'Anonymi "Aurea Gemma"', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 1 (1943), 41-57; dans *Selected Studies*, pp. 247-263.
12. 'The "King's Advent" and the enigmatic panels in the doors of Santa Sabina', *The Art Bulletin*, 26 (1944), 207-231; 'L'avvento del sovrano', dans *La sovranità dell'artista*, pp. 105-161.
13. 'The problem of medieval world unity', *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1942*, 3 (1944), 31-37; dans *Selected Studies*, pp. 76-81.
14. 'How the Pre-Hitler German Universities Were Run', *Western College Association: Adresses of 1945* (Fall Meeting, 10-XI-1945, Mills College, California), 3-7.
15. 'The Quinity of Winchester', *The Art Bulletin*, 29 (1947), 73-85; dans *Selected Studies*, pp. 100-120.
16. 'Christus-Fiscus', dans Edgar Salin, *Synopsis. Festgabe für Alfred Weber* (Heidelberg: L. Schneider, 1949), 223-235; dans *mourir pour le patrie*.
17. *Introduction à Weckmann, Luis, Las bulas alejandrinas de 1493 y la teoría política del Papado medieval; estudio de la supremacía papal sobre islas, 1091-1493* (México: Univ. Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Historia, 1949), pp. 7-11.
18. 'Pro patria mori in medieval political thought', *The American Historical Review*, 56 (1951), 472-492; dans *Selected Studies*, pp. 303-24; *mourir pour la patrie*.
19. 'Dante's "two suns"', dans *Semitic and Oriental Studies. A volume presented to William Popper on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday October 29, 1949*, éd. de Walter J. Fischel (Berkeley: University of California, 1951), pp. 217-231; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 264-83; 'I "due soli" di Dante', dans *La sovranità dell'artista*, pp. 83-103.

20. 'Der Gastfreund', dans *Albrecht Bernstorff zum Gedächtnis* (Munich: 1952), pp. 53-56.
21. 'Kaiser Friedrich II. und das Königsbild des Hellenismus (Marginalia miscellanea)', dans *Varia Variorum. Festgabe für Karl Reinhardt* (Münster-Cologne: 1952), pp. 169-193; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 264-83.
22. 'Deus per naturam, Deus per gratiam. A note on mediaeval political theology', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 45 (1952), 253-277; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 121-37.
23. "Σεβοπορος δίκει", *American Journal of Archeology*, 57 (1953), 65-70; dans *Selected Studies*, pp. 1-6.
24. 'Inalienability: a note on canonical practice and the English coronation oath in the 13th century', *Speculum*, 29 (1954), 488-502; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 138-50.
25. 'The Carolingian King in the Bible of San Paolo fuori le mura', dans *Late classical and mediaeval studies in honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr.*, éd. de Kurt Weitzmann (Princeton: 1955), pp. 287-300; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 82-94..
26. 'Invocatio nominis imperatoris (On vv. 21-25 of Cielo d'Alcamo's *Contrasto*)', *Bollettino del Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani*, 3 (1955), 35-50.
27. 'Mysteries of the state. An absolutist concept and its late mediaeval origins', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 48 (1955), 65-91. C'est un essai lu lors de la session conjointe de l' 'American Catholic Historical Association' et de l' 'American Historical Association' (Chicago, 28 décembre 1953). Publication élargie en espagnol, traduction par le Dr. Rodríguez Aranda, sous le titre 'Secretos de Estado (Un concepto absolutista y sus tardíos orígenes medievales)', *Revista de Estudios Políticos*, 104 (1959), 37-70. Il indique qu'il approfondit ce thème dans son livre *Les deux corps du roi*; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 381-398; *Mourir pour la patrie*.
28. 'The baptism of the apostles', *Dumbarton Oaks papers*, 9-10 (1956), 203-251.
29. 'Feudalism' in the Byzantine Empire', dans *Feudalism in History*, éd. de Rushton Coulborn (Princeton: 1956), pp. 151-166.
30. 'The prologue to Fleta and the school of Petrus de Vineia', *Speculum*, 32 (1957), 231-249; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 167-83.
31. 'Zu den Rechtsgrundlagen der Kaisersage', *Deutsches Archiv*, 13 (1957), 115-150; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 284-307.
32. 'On transformations of Apolline ethics', dans *Charites. Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, éd. de Konrad Schauenburg (Bonn: 1957), 265-274; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 399-408; 'L'etica apollinea e le sue trasformazioni', dans *La sovranità dell'artista*, pp. 39-53.
33. 'The archer in the Ruthwell Cross', *The Art Bulletin*, 42 (1960), 57-59; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 95-9.
34. 'On the golden marriage belt and the marriage rings of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 14 (1960), 1-16.
35. 'Gods in uniform', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 105 (1961), 368-393; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 7-24. 'Divinità in uniforme', dans *La sovranità dell'artista*, pp. 55-81.
36. 'Kingship under the impact of scientific jurisprudence', dans *Twelfth-century Europe and the foundations of modern society*, Proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Division of humanities of the university of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin Institute for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, november 12-14 (1957), éd. de Marshall Clagett, Gaines Post y Robert Reynolds (Madison: 1961), pp. 89-111; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 151-66.
37. 'The sovereignty of the artist. A note on legal maxims and Renaissance theories of art', dans *De artibus opuscula XL. Essays in honour of Erwin Panofsky*, éd. de Millard Meiss (New York: 1961), 267-279; et *Mourir pour la patrie* 'La sovranità dell'artista', dans *La sovranità dell'artista*, pp. 17-38; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 25-36.
38. 'Puer exoriens: On the Hypapante in the Mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore', dans *Perennitas: Beiträge zur christlichen Archäologie und Kunst, zur Geschichte der Literatur, der Liturgie und des Mönchtums sowie zur Philosophie des Rechts und zur politischen Philosophie PP. Thomas Michels OSB. zum 70. Geburtstag*, éd. de Hugo Rahner et Emmanuel von Severus (Münster:

Aschendorff, 1963), 118-135; dans *Selected studies*, pp. 25-36; "Puer exoriens", dans *La sovranità dell'artista*, pp. 163-80.

39. 'Oriens Augusti-Lever du Roi', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17 (1963), 117-177.

40. 'Constantinus Strator. Marginalien zum Constitutum Constantini', dans *Mullus. Festschrift Theodor Klauser. Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband*, 1 (Münster: 1964), pp. 181-9.

3. *Ouvrages sur Ernst Kantorowicz*

Eckhart Grünewald, *Ernst Kantorowicz und Stefan George. Beiträge zur Biographie des historikers bis zum Jahre 1938 und zu seinem Jugendwerk 'Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite'*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1982.

Jerzy Strzelczyk (ed.), *Ernst Kantorowicz (1895-1963). Soziales Milieu und wissenschaftliche Relevanz*, Poznan: Instytut Historii UAM, 2000.

Wolfgang Ernst et Cornelia Vismann (eds.), *Geschichtskörp. Zur Aktualität von Ernst H. Kantorowicz*, Munich, Fink, 1998.

Alain Boureau, *Histoires d'un historien. Kantorowicz*, Paris: Gallinard, 1990.

Marina Valensise, "Storici e Storia. Ernst Kantorowicz", *Rivista Storica Italiana*, 101 (1989).

Yzkov Malkiel, "Ernst H. Kantorowicz", dans *On four modern humanists, Hofmannsthal, Gundolf, Curtius, Kantorowicz*, éd. de Arthur R. Evans (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970).

Robert Louis Benson et Johannes Fried (eds.), *Ernst Kantorowicz: Erträge der Doppeltagung*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997.

F. Norman Cantor, "The Nazi Twins. Perry Ernst Schramm and Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz", dans son *Inventing the Middle Ages. The Lives, works, and ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century*, New York, Quill William Morrow, 1991.

Ralph E. Giesey, "Ernst Kantorowicz: Scholarly Triumphs and Academic Travails in Weimar Germany and the United States", *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 30 (1985), 191-202.

Joseph Maki, "Ernst Kantorowicz: History as New Mythology", dans son *My history, the making of a modern historiography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003).

Robert E. Lerner. "Ernst Kantorowicz and Theodor E. Mommsen", dans *An Interrupted Past*, éd. de H. Lehmann et J.J. Sheehan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

François Louis Ganshof (1895 – 1980)

Dirk HEIRBAUT

(Université de Ghent, Belgien)

Aniceto MASFERRER

(Universidad de Valencia, Spain)

Life and career

François Louis Ganshof was born in Bruges on March 14, 1895 in a very distinguished family. His father was a lawyer and his mother, a lawyer's daughter too, was descended from general van der Meersch who had led the revolutionary armies of the Southern Netherlands in their revolt against Joseph II at the end of the eighteenth century. To foreigners Ganshof may be well-known as a scholar, but in legal circles in Belgium his brother Walter Jean Ganshof van der Meersch –in a very unusual move for a Belgian– he added his mother's name to his, to ensure that her great family name would not die out–, is still much more famous, as he was, as Commissioner for the Security of the State, responsible at the end of World War II for restoring order in newly liberated Belgium (at the height of his power and influence he was even called the 'viceroy of Belgium'). Another notable achievement of his has been that, as Belgium's highest senior magistrate, he was responsible for making the highest court in the land accept the principle that international rules should have priority over Belgian law¹.

François Louis Ganshof might have had a career like his brother as a magistrate or a civil servant. In fact, during both World Wars he served in the Belgian army. In the First he was a lieutenant, junior grade, working for the Geographical Department of the Belgian army; in the Second he took part as commander in the short, though valiant resistance of the Belgian army to the German invasion in 1940. In 1944 he was his brother's trusted right hand man in pacifying Belgium². Thus, Ganshof has become one of the few historians who not only wrote about history,

Note: several of Ganshof's works were translated and/or reprinted. Unless otherwise indicated, references will be to the first edition. Because it was impossible to look up all editions and translations, no distinction will be made between revised and non-revised editions or translations. The best way of accessing later editions and translations is by looking up the publication at the date of its first edition in the following bibliography: VAN CAENEDEGEM, Raoul, *In memoriam F.L. Ganshof (14 maart 1895 - 26 juli 1980)*. *Bibliografie Prof. Dr. F.L. Ganshof*, in: "Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Jaarboek", 1980, 242-251. Later editions and translations are indicated in the footnotes.

¹ These are only a few of the highlights in the career of one of the key figures of Belgian twentieth century history. For a biography of Ganshof's brother, see MARTIN, D., *Ganshof van der Meersch, burggraaf Walter (Brugge 18 mei 1900 - Tintange 12 september 1993)*, in: "Nieuwe encyclopedie van de Vlaamse beweging", Tiel, Lannoo, 1998, 1230-1231 and the literature referred to there.

² His secret reports of his activities have been published by Wilfried Pawuels, *De bevrijdingsdagen van 1944: de geheime rapporten van François Louis Ganshof* (De Nederlanden: Antwerp, 1994).

but also made it. In 1919, he was a member of the Belgian delegation at the Paris Conference and the Versailles Peace Treaty which ended World War I, although at that time he had not yet finished his university studies, interrupted because of the war³. He obtained his doctoral degrees in philosophy and letters in 1921, and in law in 1922, both at Ghent University, where Henri Pirenne, arguably Belgium's greatest historian ever, was his teacher. Thereafter he went to study with Ferdinand Lot in Paris and was enrolled at the bar, but his career there was a very short one, as he became a lecturer for two courses at Ghent University in 1923.

There, he taught all sorts of medieval history until his retirement in 1961⁴, in the meantime having become professor ordinarius in 1932, and serving as dean of his faculty in 1937-1938. It is to be remarked here that he started his career at Ghent University when it was bilingual, so that he was teaching in both French and Dutch. When the university became unilingual Dutch in the 1930's, Ganshof succeeded his master Pirenne, who had no wish to teach in Dutch and left Ghent for Brussels⁵. Ganshof was a member of the editorial boards of several reviews, president of the *Commission royale pour la publication des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique* and working member of the Royal Flemish Academy for Sciences, Letters and Arts, corresponding or foreign member of so many foreign academies and other organisations that it would take too much paper to list all of them here. The same holds for the many prizes he received, so that it should be sufficient to say that in his native Belgium he received the Francqui prize and the State Prize for Historical Sciences, whereas thirteen universities from other countries awarded him a doctorate *honoris causa*. After this long and distinguished career Ganshof died in Brussels on June 26, 1980.

Ganshof: a Pirenne student going his own way

When a scholar is awarded as many honours as Ganshof, and, at the same time, is the student of an even more famous scholar, it is justified to ask whether the student did not achieve greatness in the slipstream of his master. Such a question is only justified, if one does not know Belgian (or for that matter also Dutch) historians. The idea of a 'school', i.e. of students following in their master's footsteps, is very alien to them. The great Belgian historians are rather isolated figures, teaching their students the craft, but thereafter leaving them free to develop on their own. Thus, if anything, it is almost normal for students to have interests very different from their masters. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of François

³ Ganshof was present as an expert of historical geography, the subject of his first publications (*La Belgique en 1786. Les Pays-Bas Autrichiens, les principautés de Liège et de Stavelot-Malmédy, le duché de Bouillon et leur évolution territoriale de 1713 à 1794* (Brussels: Elsevier, 1919) (Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique, 1919-1932, V); *La Belgique sous la domination française (1794-1814). Les départements belges et les départements voisins au 1er janvier 1812* (Brussels: Elsevier, 1919) (Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique, 1919-1932, VI); *La Belgique dans le Royaume des Pays-Bas (1814-1830)* (Brussels: Elsevier, 1920) (Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique, 1919-1932, VII); *La Belgique de 1830-1839* (Brussels: Elsevier, 1920) (Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique, 1919-1932, VIII).

⁴ The complete list of the courses he taught, can be found in *Rijksuniversiteit te Gent. Liber memorialis 1913-1960*, éd. by Luykx Theo (Ghent: RUG Rectoraat, 1960), I, pp. 245-247.

⁵ About the languages at Ghent university, see *Kroniek van de strijd voor de vernederlandsing van de Gentse universiteit*, ed. by Karel De Klerk e.a. (Ghent: RUG Archief, 1985).

Louis Ganshof. In fact, Ganshof became a specialist of legal and institutional history, a subject about which Pirenne could teach him little, so that he had to acquire his knowledge by reading foreign literature. His interest in legal and institutional history was stimulated by Ferdinand Lot, but Lot was not a legal historian himself. In fact, Ganshof's interest in law and institutions goes back to his childhood, to his maternal grandfather, who Ganshof fondly recalled thus: "*Si nous avons placé en tête de ce petit volume le nom d'Auguste Van der Meersch, de son vivant avocat à Bruges, c'est qu'il fut pour son petit-fils, le premier maître qui l'a initié à l'histoire de son peuple. Avec l'amour de la langue de la Flandre et de sa culture, il a su lui inspirer le culte de son passé*"⁶.

Even though Ganshof went his own way, he was, of course not free of Pirenne's influence. He sometimes wrote about social and economic history, Pirenne's favourite fields of study, but always in such a way that its legal and institutional aspects were highlighted. Besides, at times Ganshof was sceptical of his master's great theories⁷. Only one book can be seen as continuing Pirenne's work, a study of the development of cities in the area between Loire and Rhine, first published in 1941⁸, but as Ganshof looks at this subject from a topographer's viewpoint, his World War I experiences in the Geographical Department of the Belgian army seem to be just as important an influence as Pirenne. Besides, it would have been hard for him, loving his native Bruges, one of the most beautiful medieval cities in the world, not to be interested in the development of medieval cities⁹. Another influence by Pirenne might be Ganshof's 'belgitude'. Ganshof, like Pirenne, was a Belgian patriot and had no qualms about giving one of his books the title *La Belgique Carolingienne*¹⁰, even though Belgium would only come into existence more than a thousand years after the death of Charlemagne. Ganshof saw his study of history as a way of serving Belgium, as becomes evident in the foreword of one of his books: "*Ce petit livre a été écrit sur l'amicale invitation de Mme Suzanne Charlier-Tassien... Nous n'avons pas cru pouvoir nous dérober à cet appel, puisqu'auSSI bien il s'agissait de servir la Belgique en répandant une exacte connaissance de son histoire au sein du grand public*"¹¹. For Ganshof who had served his country in two wars, writing about its history, was just another, though much more preferable, answer to a call to arms. There is no need to see Pirenne's influence here, Ganshof was himself enough of a patriot.

However, Ganshof was a Belgian and a Flemish patriot. The quotation above is to be found in the introduction to a study of Flemish, not Belgian, history. To Ganshof, his allegiance to one part of the country, Dutch-speaking Flanders and its language, was not contrary to his love for Belgium as such. Ganshof supported the fight for the recognition of Dutch as a language of science in Belgium, but he also wrote in French and sometimes a study was first written in Dutch and then in French

⁶ Ganshof, *La Flandre sous les premiers comtes* (Brussels : La renaissance du livre, 1943), pp. 10.

⁷ See e.g. 'Quelques aspects principaux de la vie économique dans la monarchie franque au VIIe siècle', in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, V (1958), 73-101.

⁸ *Over de stadsontwikkeling tussen Loire en Rijn gedurende de middeleeuwen* (Antwerp : Standaard, 1941) (second edition, 1944); (French translation, Paris : PUF, 1943).

⁹ He wrote a few short articles about the history of Bruges, e.g. 'Bruges au moyen âge', in *Congrès archéologique de France. CXXe session* (Paris : Flandre, 1964), pp. 12-15; 'Iets over Brugge gedurende de preconstitutioneele periode van haar geschiedenis', in *Nederlandsche historiebladen*, I (1938), 281-303.

¹⁰ *La Belgique Carolingienne* (Brussels : La renaissance du livre, 1958).

¹¹ Ganshof, *La Belgique Carolingienne*, 9.

or the other way round¹². In this, he was the opposite of Pirenne, who had no love for the Flemish movement, which fought for the recognition of Dutch as the language of Flanders, and also of many of today's Flemings who would rather get rid of Belgium. To Ganshof, it was not Belgium or Flanders, but Flanders and Belgium.

Ganshof's works

a. *The universal works*

Ganshof has written almost six hundred publications, and even if one would discount the smaller ones like reviews of books, there are still too many left to study them all in detail. Only some general patterns can be indicated here, though this is an injustice to the wide scope of his scholarship. In fact, Ganshof could write about very varied subjects of medieval history and has also authored some great general works. Examples of these abound: his *La Flandre sous les premiers comtes*¹³, *La Belgique Carolingienne*¹⁴, and his contributions to great general series or general works like the *Geschiedenis van Vlaanderen* of Van Roosbroeck¹⁵, the (old) *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*¹⁶, *The Cambridge economic history of Europe*¹⁷, *Pelgrimstocht der mensheid*¹⁸, the *Histoire générale* of Glotz¹⁹, the *Propyläen Weltgeschichte*²⁰, or Renouvin's *Histoire des relations internationales*²¹. Apart from these general publications, Ganshof's works seem to concentrate on a certain theme and a certain period: law and institutions from the eighth to the thirteenth century, in either a Flemish/Belgian or a European context, though there are of course exceptions,

¹² E.g. his book about the development of cities (see note 8) was first published in Dutch, then in French and, likewise, his book about the capitularies (see note 50). On the other hand, *La Flandre sous les premiers comtes* was first available in French (Brussels: La renaissance du livre, 1943); new editions in 1944 and 1949; Dutch translation, Antwerp, Standaard, 1944.

¹³ See note 12.

¹⁴ See note 10.

¹⁵ 'Staatkundige geschiedenis. XIIe, XIIIe, XIVe eeuw. De staatsinstellingen van Vlaanderen en Brabant', in Robert Van Roosbroeck *Geschiedenis van Vlaanderen, 1936-1949* (Brussels: Standaard, 1937), II, pp. 9-188.

¹⁶ 'Het tijdperk van de Merovingen. Het tijdperk van de Karolingen. Het laat-Karolingisch tijdperk', in (old) *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 1949-1958* (Utrecht: De Haan, 1949), I, pp. 252-366.

¹⁷ 'Mediaeval agrarian society in its prime. France, the Low Countries and Western Germany', in *Cambridge economic history of Europe, 1941-1977* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941), I, pp. 278-322 (reprinted in 1942; separately printed with biographical additions, Wetteren, De Meester, 1947; new edition, Cambridge, 1966 in collaboration with Adriaan Verhulst).

¹⁸ 'De middeleeuwen', in *De pelgrimstocht der mensheid 1925-1938*, ed. by Jan Berkelbach van der Sprenkel (Utrecht: De Haan, 1937), pp. 170-288, (new editions in 1940, 1948, 1952, 1960).

¹⁹ *Histoire du moyen âge*. t. I: 'Les Destinées de l'Empire en Occident de 395 à 888', ed. By Gustave Glotz, Ferdinand Lot and Christian Pfister (Paris: PUF, 1934); (second edition, 1941).

²⁰ *Das Hochmittelalter. Von Bernhard von Clairvaux zu Papst Bonifaz VIII* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 1963) (Propyläen Weltgeschichte, 1960-1964), V (later editions, 1968, 1991; CD-ROM version Frankfurt, Directmedia, 1999).

²¹ Ed. by Pierre Renouvin, *Le moyen âge*, t. I: 'Histoire des relations internationales' (Paris: Hachette, 1953), (later editions, 1958, 1964, 1968); (Spanish translation, Madrid: Aguilar, 1960); (Italian translation, Florence: Vallecchi, 1961); (English translation, New York: 1971).

like his few publications on Byzantine history²². One should, however, not always trust the titles of Ganshof's publications. Even if they seem to indicate a social or economic subject, Ganshof always managed to lead it back to its legal and institutional aspects²³.

b. *The thesis: a sin of youth, forgotten later?*

Within this general preference for law and institutions several main themes can be distinguished, but again some works stand on their own. Strangely enough one of these is Ganshof's doctoral thesis, published in 1924: *Etude sur les ministérielles en Flandre et en Lotharingie*²⁴. In this Ganshof studies the ministerials, a group of persons in the high middle ages who combined a high social status with a servile condition. Whereas many others do not manage to study anything else but the subject of their thesis for the rest of their careers, Ganshof never went back to it. After 1924, he stayed clear of this subject, but the reasons for this are not known. Reading this book, one has the impression that Ganshof was still learning at the time he wrote it, that he was still trying to find his way as an historian. Moreover, though at the time this thesis was favourably received, obtaining a prize from the Académie royale de Belgique and assuring its author of a position at the university, it is with hindsight, a book that may be called unworthy of 'the great Ganshof', i.e. good for others, but not really at the level, anyone familiar with his later work would expect of him. It may be that Ganshof himself shared this judgement and, therefore, never returned to his study of the ministerials.

c. '*Ganshof of feudalism*'

One of Ganshof's early publications was about feudalism, a theme that he would study throughout his career. In fact, to many historians, Ganshof 'is' feudalism. Americans sometimes called him 'Ganshof of feudalism' and others later coined the expression 'Ganshofian feudalism'²⁵. Although Ganshof wrote many fine articles about feudalism, the main themes being feudal courts²⁶ and the union of benefice and vassalage²⁷, his fame rests mainly on one book, his *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, first published in French in 1944, with several new editions thereafter, and also transla-

²² However, Ganshof's few publications about Byzantine history, in one way or another studied themes related to the rest of his research, like the military aid the count of Flanders sent the Byzantine emperor after the defeat at Manzikert ('Robrecht de Fries en Alexios Comnenos', in *Handelingen der koninklijke Zuidnederlandse maatschappij voor taal- en letterkunde en geschiedenis*, XIV (1960), 145-160. (French revised translation in: "Byzantion", XXXI (1961).

²³ E.g. his publications about tolls (for example, *Het tolwezen in het Frankische rijk onder de Merowingien. Het tolwezen in het Frankische rijk onder de Karolingen*, in *Mededelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie van wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten, klasse der letteren*, XX/4 en XXI/1 (Brussels: 1958-1959).

²⁴ *Mémoires de l'académie royale de Belgique*, classe des lettres, second series, XX (Brussels: Lamertin, 1926).

²⁵ E.g. Chris Wickham, « Structures féodales et féodalisme dans l'Occident Méditerranéen (Xe-XIIIe siècles). Bilan et perspectives de recherche Rome », 1980, in *English historical review*, XCVII (1982), 835-837.

²⁶ E.g. 'Note sur la compétence des cours féodales en France', in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne*, (Brussels: Vromant, 1926), pp.161-170.

²⁷ E.g. 'Note sur les origines de l'union du bénéfice avec la vassalité', in *Etudes d'histoire dédiées à la mémoire de Henri Pirenne* (Brussels: Nouvelle société d'édition, 1937), pp.173-190.

tions, sometimes re-edited, in English, German, Spanish, Portuguese and Japanese²⁸. This small book did not stand alone, as Ganshof was only one of the many scholars who studied feudalism in the years before and after World War II, like Heinrich Mitteis, Joseph Calmette, Marc Bloch, Robert Boutruche, Léopold Génicot and Noël Didier²⁹. These authors and their contemporaries were responsible for elaborating what one could call the classic view of feudalism.

Although they had many differences of opinion, the classic authors on feudalism also shared some general opinions. The first was that the High Middle Ages (tenth to thirteenth centuries) were the classic era of feudalism. This implied two things: first of all, that in the High Middle Ages feudalism was the central element of society, so that one could talk of a 'feudal society'; second, that in the High Middle Ages feudalism was in its full bloom, whereas it was still in its infancy in the Carolingian era, and became only a shadow of its former self, relevant for private, but not for public law, after 1300. This classic feudalism of the High Middle Ages was seen as being typical for the heartland of the Carolingian empire, Northern France, Western Germany and the regions in between, anything else belonging to the periphery, where a pure feudalism could not be found. This feudalism, so prominent in the successor states of the Carolingian empire, was also seen as an element of disintegration, a centrifugal power, which had contributed to the break-up of Charlemagne's state.

Within the studies of classic feudalism, two tendencies can be distinguished. Some authors focused on the social and political aspects of feudalism, i.e. feudal society, whereas others limited themselves to studying its legal elements. One of these is Ganshof, as becomes clear in his definition of feudalism: 'la féodalité peut être définie comme un ensemble d'institutions créant et régissant des obligations d'obéissance et de service - principalement militaire - de la part d'un homme libre, dit "vassal", envers un homme libre dit "seigneur", et des obligations de protection et d'entretien de la part du "seigneur" à l'égard du "vassal"; l'obligation d'entretien ayant le plus souvent pour effet la concession par le seigneur au vassal d'un bien dit "fief"'³⁰. This narrow feudalism is 'Ganshofian feudalism', a feudalism that is so legal that it can no longer be distinguished from feudal law. This narrow view should not be overestimated, as Ganshof was not against a broader view, against the idea of a feudal society³¹. His definition seems to be more of a way of defining it in his terms. Ganshof had nothing against studying feudalism in a broader context, he was full of praise for books like Marc Bloch's *Société féodale*; he only wanted to assure that the legal aspects of what was, to him, at heart a legal phenomenon, should not be overlooked.

²⁸ *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité* (Brussels : Office de publicité, 1944) (later editions, 1947, 1957, Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1968 ; Paris : Tallandier 1982; English translation, London : Longman, 1952, later editions, New York : Harper & Row, 1961, London/ New York : Longan/ Harper & Row, 1964, Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 1996; Portuguese translation, Lisbon : Publicações Europa-America, 1959; German translation, Darmstadt : Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961, later editions, 1967, 1970, 1975, 1983, 1989; Spanish translation (with an Appendix by Luis de Valdeavellano), Barcelona : Ediciones Ariel, 1963; Japanese translation, Tokyo, 1968; Italian translation, Turin : Einaudi, 1989).

²⁹ For the references to their books, see the bibliography added to the 1982 edition.

³⁰ *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, 13 (1982 edition).

³¹ Cf. *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, 12-13.

Ganshof was not alone in studying feudalism as a legal phenomenon, Didier's book on feudal law in Hainault³² or Mitteis's *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt*³³, are at least as good and sometimes based on a more detailed study of the sources. Nevertheless, their books never were reprinted, whereas Ganshof's *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité* still is. The explanation is to be found in its title: this is a book that puts a question any student of the Middle Ages could ask: What is feudalism? The clear answer to that question is only to be found in Ganshof. His book reads as a kind of a legal manual. The confusion of the sources disappears to be replaced by a clarity that is all the more remarkable, because it is not based upon an abstract theory, but upon a very detailed erudite knowledge of the sources. Erudition and great teaching do not always go hand in hand, but in this book they are perfectly matched, and this has ensured its success. One can read libraries about feudalism without getting any wiser, and then there is this one book which says it all. An extra bonus was that the author kept on adding to his work, integrating new research by himself and others³⁴, although most of the articles he wrote on feudalism in his later career were limited to feudalism in the Carolingian era³⁵.

d. Ganshof, the Fleming

As has already been mentioned, Ganshof was, in his way, a patriot. He was very proud of being from Bruges, Flanders and Belgium. Although he wrote a few articles about Bruges, and some books, which can be seen as Belgian, Flanders had his special attention. One should however not confuse Flanders, today's Dutchspeaking part of Belgium and the old county of Flanders, mainly held as fief from the king of France (Crown Flanders), though a small part of it was held from the German king (Imperial Flanders). It was the latter, not the former that was the subject of Ganshof's research. His main articles and books dealt with the judicial organisation³⁶ and urban law³⁷. The key publication was his book about early Flemish history, *La Flandre sous les premiers comtes*³⁸, and his study of the local comital feudal courts, *Recherches sur les tribunaux de châtelainie en Flandre*³⁹. Ganshof's publications about Flemish institutions culminated in another of his masterpieces, his article about Flanders in Lot and Fawtiers, *Institutions françaises au moyen âge* in 1957⁴⁰. Yet,

³² Noël Didier, *Le droit des fiefs dans la coutume de Hainaut au moyen âge* (Paris : Picard, 1945).

³³ Heinrich Mitteis, *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt. Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1933).

³⁴ The last 'update' by Ganshof is to be found in the 1975 German edition, but the 1982 French edition has a more recent bibliography.

³⁵ E.g. 'L'origine des rapports féodo-vassaliques: les rapports féodo-vassaliques dans la monarchie franque au nord des Alpes à l'époque carolingienne', in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, I (1954), 3-45.

³⁶ E.g. 'Die Rechtsprechung des gräflichen Hofgerichtes in Flandern bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts', in *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, LXVIII (1938), 163-177; 'Etude sur le faussement de jugement dans le droit flamand des XIIe et XIIIe siècles', in *Bulletin de la commission royale des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique*, XIV (1935) 115-140.

³⁷ E.g. 'Le droit urbain en Flandre au début de la première phase de son histoire', in *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, XIX (1951), 387-416.

³⁸ See note 12.

³⁹ *Recherches sur les tribunaux de châtelainie en Flandre avant le milieu du XIIIe siècle* (Antwerp : De Sikkels, 1932).

⁴⁰ 'La Flandre', in *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge*, ed. by Ferdinand Lot and Robert Fawtier (Paris : PUF, 1957) I, pp.343-426.

the great in depth study of Flemish judicial organisation which he had hoped to make in the 1930's was never written and after 1957 Ganshof almost stopped writing about Flanders. The reason is that his research into Flanders, a Carolingian successor state, inevitably led him to study its origins, the Carolingians.

e. Ganshof and the tragedy of Charlemagne

Ganshof's study of classic feudalism and of Flemish institutions made him realise the importance of the Carolingian era for the history of medieval institutions. Therefore, his post World War II research was mainly about Carolingian institutions.

Although he had written about Carolingian subjects before the war, including even a general book about Carolingian history⁴¹, these studies did not really leave a great impression, unlike Ganshof's later publications by which he became known as probably the greatest scholar of Carolingian studies in his time. Again, Ganshof's work is of an impressive variety, as he wrote many of his best Carolingian articles for the congresses of the Société Jean Bodin and the Settimane di Spoleto⁴². These would have a central theme which Ganshof would then study for the Carolingian era. In fact, in certain years one can guess what the topic of these congresses was, by just looking at Ganshof's publications for those years.

However, there was a central theme underlying Ganshof's work, as becomes very clear when consulting the two collections of his Carolingian articles which have been published in English⁴³. To him the Carolingian state was at its heart weak, the historical importance of Carolingian institutions not so much being the impact they had on their own times, but the influence they would exert on the successor states. This was an opinion only to be expected from a man who had come to study the Carolingian era because of the influence they had on their successor states. In their own time, Carolingian institutions were instruments for strengthening central power⁴⁴, and at first Charlemagne seems to have had some success. However, his later years show an ageing and failing emperor, whose empire is already crumbling before his death, hence articles like *La fin du règne de Charlemagne. Une décomposition*⁴⁵, *L'échec de Charlemagne*⁴⁶ and *Het falen van Karel de Grote*⁴⁷. Ganshof's Charlemagne is somewhat of a tragic figure, a man who could have been great, whom later historians have called great, but who was not. Likewise, Ganshof is kinder towards Louis the Pious⁴⁸, like his father a failure, but can one blame the son for failing to achieve what his father could not?

⁴¹ See note 19.

⁴² For the Settimane, see Cinzio Violante, 'Ricordi Spoletini di François-Louis Ganshof e di Jean-François Lemarignier', in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, XXIX (1983), I, 67-71; for the Société Jean Bodin, see John Gilissen, 'In memoriam Frans L. Ganshof 1895-1980', in *Bulletin de la commission royale des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique*, XXX (1980-1981), vii.

⁴³ *Frankish institutions under Charlemagne*, trans. By Bryce and Mary Lyon (Providence: Brown university press, 1968); *The Carolingians and the Frankish monarchy. Studies in Carolingian history*, Janet Sondheimer (London: Longman, 1971).

⁴⁴ See e.g. 'Charlemagne et le serment', in *Mélanges dédiées à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris: PUF, 1951), pp. 259-270 (English translation, *Carolingians*, nr. 7).

⁴⁵ 'La fin du règne de Charlemagne. Une décompositio', in *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte*, XXVI-II (1948), 533-552 (English translation, *Carolingians*, nr. 12).

⁴⁶ 'L'échec de Charlemagne', in *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres. Comptes rendus des séances* (1947), 248-254 (English translation, *Carolingians*, nr. 13).

That Ganshof was trained as a lawyer is nowhere more evident than in his study of Charlemagne. For Ganshof, the main instrument for Charlemagne in imposing his will upon his enormous empire, was legislation, though of a special kind, the *capitularia*, “des édits subdivisés en articles, émanant des chefs d'état carolingiens”⁴⁹. By these *capitularia* Charlemagne tried to either enforce existing rules which had been neglected, or to adapt these rules to new circumstances, which sometimes meant creating new rules. Because the *capitularia* were so important as instrument of Carolingian power, Ganshof made a small study of their technical aspects. The title of his book about them is again his program: *Wat waren de capitularia*?⁵⁰ (What were the capitularies?). What *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité* is to feudalism this book is to the capitularies: a book that gives a clear introduction to the technical aspects of what had hitherto for many people been a confusing subject. Again, translations were published, and the author was hailed for his clarity.

In his *Wat waren de capitularia*? Ganshof did not go into the details of their effects. These are to be found in his general publications⁵¹, where it becomes clear that the *capitularia* fell short of their objectives, as the emperor had to reissue the same orders over and over again, his power being too personal, too dependent on his presence, to have much lasting effect. At the end, Charlemagne is a crisis-manager who failed to contain crises. It should be stressed here that Ganshof's Carolingian studies were to a certain extent only preparatory, because his original intent and the expectation of his colleagues was that he would write the final (in so far as any history book can be final) great biography of Charlemagne⁵². Yet, it was not to be. What the scholarly world has to miss because of that, can be experienced by reading his *La Belgique Carolingienne*⁵³, one of his best books, which was based on earlier articles written in Dutch for the (old) *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*⁵⁴. When a new version of this *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden* was published in the early 1980's, only one author's articles had stood the test of time, and were only updated, not replaced: Ganshof's⁵⁵. This is no mean feat if one takes into account that more than four hundred scholars worked on the new *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*.

⁴⁷ 'Het falen van Karel de Grote', in *Verslag der algemene vergadering der leden van het historisch genootschap gehouden te Utrecht* (1948), 26-46.

⁴⁸ 'Louis the Pious reconsidered', in *History*, XLII (1957), 171-180 (also published in: *Carolingians*, nr. 14).

⁴⁹ Quoted from the French translation of his book about the *capitularia* (see next note), 36.

⁵⁰ *Wat waren de capitularia*? (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie, 1955) (Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, XXII) (French translation in: *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, XXXV (1957) 33-87, 196-246, published separately, Paris: Sirey, 1958; German translation, Weimar: Böhlau, 1961).

⁵¹ Most of these can be found in the collections mentioned in note 43.

⁵² B. Lyon, 'Foreword', in *Frankish institutions*, ix.

⁵³ See note 10.

⁵⁴ See note 16.

⁵⁵ Dirk Peter Block and Adriaan Verhulst, 'Inleiding', in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 1977-1983* (Haarlem: Fibula van Dishoeck, 1981), I, p. 20.

Ganshof's 'philosophy of history' and his 'failure'

Foreign scholars may be forgiven for thinking that we miss only one major work of Ganshof, his Charlemagne biography. There were a few more: a general history of medieval institutions, an introduction to the sources of medieval history and an historical introduction to private law. Ganshof's college notes about all these were available in Dutch to his Ghent students⁵⁶. In fact, the book about medieval institutions was as good as ready and an English editor was willing to publish a translation, but Ganshof refrained from publishing it, because he thought his text was immature. Anyone who has read it, can only wonder what the mature version might have been.

Ganshof's failure to publish what could have been works as influential as his *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, is related to his 'philosophy of history', a term which is not very apt here, as it implies great theories of the author, about which he has written lengthy articles. In reality, Ganshof never wrote about his philosophy of history and abhorred this subject (he got rid of the books about philosophy he received as soon as he could), though his ideas are very clear. Ganshof was a very Rankian historian, whose device really was: *Was nicht in den Akten, hat nicht gelebt*, but this 'positivism' was more a practical attitude, than the consequence of an elaborate philosophy of history. Because of his positivistic bent, Ganshof's preferred method of working was to neglect the literature about the subject he studied, which does not mean that he did not read it, but rather that he did not write his publication as a response to another author (for example in his book about the *capitularia*: "*Il nous a paru superflu de placer toujours, en face de nos opinions propres, celles des auteurs qui se sont occupés de la question.*")⁵⁷, using only what could be based upon the sources. When he had to rely on literature, he profoundly excused himself for not justifying every statement by direct references to the sources as he usually did⁵⁸. Preferably, every new publication meant a new consultation of the relevant sources, as Ganshof was very critical and even his own publications were still less trustworthy to him than the sources themselves. Ganshof self-criticism went so far that when he had to write an article in French about Flemish institutions⁵⁹, he did not just translate an older article of his in Dutch⁶⁰, but wrote a new one instead. Not being satisfied with it, he threw it away and wrote a new version from scratch. It was published in 1957, followed one year later by his last book⁶¹. Thereafter, he would write no more great books, although he was to live for another twenty-two years.

After 1958, Ganshof never judged his great works to be ready, to be finished, there was always one more detail to be studied first (it is typical for Ganshof that more than thirty of his articles start with *Note sur*, or a like expression)⁶², and the fact that he found an occasion for studying these details in the thematic congress-

⁵⁶ *Geschiedenis van de middeleeuwse instellingen*, 1946-1947; *Maatschappij en instellingen van de middeleeuwen*, 1947 (later versions, 1949, 1953, 1957, 1959); *Encyclopedie van de geschiedenis. Middeleeuwen*, 1951 (second version 1955); *Geschiedkundige inleiding tot het burgerlijk recht*, 1956 (later versions, 1956, 1957).

⁵⁷ French translation of his book about the *capitularia* (see note 50), 34.

⁵⁸ 'Les traits généraux du système d'institutions de la monarchie franque', in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, IX (1962), 91.

⁵⁹ See note 40.

⁶⁰ See note 15.

⁶¹ See note 10.

⁶² E.g. 'Note sur les Capitula de causis cum episcopis et abbatibus tractandis de 811', in *Studia Gratiana*, XIII (1967), 1-25.

es of the Société Jean Bodin and the Settimane di Spoleto only strengthened him in this. At the end of his life, he realised that he had been wrong, now that his mind was finally ready to write the next great books, the physical ability was no longer there. Like his 'hero' Charlemagne, Ganshof became some kind of a failure, a man who people called great, although they did not realise how great he really could have been. When one reads Ganshof's short and masterful description of Charlemagne's life in his dinner speech for the Medieval Academy of America in 1948⁶³, one can only feel sympathy for the emperor as described by Ganshof, not a superman, but a giant whose last years were hindered by his declining capacities, but did Ganshof realise in 1948 that somehow his last days were to mirror the emperor's?

Ganshof's method of sticking to the sources had other defects than gradually making it impossible for him to write the great syntheses which had made him famous. His method made the eighth to thirteenth centuries ideal for him: enough sources to enable a solid historical study, but not so many that he would no longer be able to consult them all. However, other periods would have been beyond him and his method also limited him to writing about political, legal and institutional history, because anything which required a leap of faith into imagination, like history of ideas, or history of mentalities, would have made him leave the solid ground his texts offered him. Likewise, Ganshof had no great liking for great and sweeping theories of a sociological nature. To him, a historian, doing sociology, was a soul lost to the true faith. In this, more than in anything else, he was the antipode of his master, Pirenne, whose *Mahomet et Charlemagne* is as 'un-Ganshoflike' as can be⁶⁴.

In the end, Ganshof's ideas about history could only lead to a study of the sources, and this is what happened. His last major work was the edition and commentary of a Carolingian source: the polyptyque of the abbey of Saint-Bertin⁶⁵. The Ganshofian 'philosophy of history', if brought to its extreme, turns historiography into nothing more than a detailed reading of the sources.

Ganshof's legacy

What is now left of Ganshof's work? First of all, as Ganshof himself was a student of Pirenne, but did not follow in the footsteps of his master, Pirenne having no real 'school', likewise Ganshof had many students, but they all went their own ways, going in directions he would not have thought of. An example is his most famous student, and Ghent University's leading historian of the post-Ganshof generation, Van Caenegem. Although Van Caenegem continued one work of Ganshof's (he published a book about the sources of medieval history for which Ganshof had laid the groundwork)⁶⁶, his career went in a very different direction when he took up

⁶³ Charlemagne, in *Speculum*, XXIV (1949), 520-527 (also published in: *Carolingians*, nr. 2).

⁶⁴ Cf. *Henri Pirenne. Le maître. L'historien* (Brussels: Le flambeau, 1936).

⁶⁵ (in collaboration with Françoise Godding-Ganshofen and Antoine De Smet), *Le polyptyque de l'abbaye de Saint-Bertin (844-859). Edition critique et commentaire* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1975) (*Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, XLV).

⁶⁶ Van Caenegem, Raoul (with the collaboration of Ganshof, François Louis), *Encyclopedie van de geschiedenis der middeleeuwen*, Ghent, Story scientia 1962 (German translation, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964; English translation, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 1978; French translation, Turnhout, Brepols, 1997).

the study of English law and other subjects, which never appear in Ganshof's work⁶⁷. Much more Ganshofian was Jan Dhondt, who in his early career wrote some studies about post-Carolingian France⁶⁸, very akin to what Ganshof had written, but thereafter switched to the study of modern history. Adriaan Verhulst studied the Carolingian domains and historical geography⁶⁹, topics which Ganshof had written about, but even then he did not really continue Ganshof's work⁷⁰. Some of 'Ganshof's intellectual grandchildren', students of his students took up his favourite subjects again⁷¹, but without having known him and sometimes going in directions he would not have approved of⁷². Ganshof's greatest influence upon his students may be a negative one. They all deeply regretted the fact that their master had not been able to write the other great books he had in him⁷³ and they set out to do all they could to avoid his mistake, and sometimes they have admirably succeeded, as anyone can see who looks at the list of the great syntheses of history published by Raoul Van Caenegem⁷⁴.

The influence of Ganshof's publications varies. His *Etude sur les ministérielles* is the oldest and most outdated of his studies⁷⁵. His universal works about the Middle Ages are still worth reading, though other books are now available, so that they are not very popular anymore. More complicated is the situation of his publications about Flemish history. For many details his work is to be corrected by what has been written by among others, Van Caenegem, Koch, Verhulst, De Hemptinne, Prevenier, De Gryse, Heirbaut and others⁷⁶. His book about the *Tribunaux de châtellenie*, for example, is no longer up to date⁷⁷. Yet, Ganshof's articles about Flemish institu-

⁶⁷ E.g. Raoul Van Caenegem, *The birth of the English common law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

⁶⁸ E.g., Jan Dhondt, *Etude sur la naissance des principautés territoriales en France* (Bruges : De tempel, 1948).

⁶⁹ E.g., Adriaan Verhulst, *De Sint-Baafsabdij te Gent en haar grondbezit (7e-14e eeuw)* (Brussels : Koninklijke Vlaamse academie, 1958) (Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, XXX); A. Verhulst, *Landschap en landbouw in middeleeuws Vlaanderen* (Brussels : 1995).

⁷⁰ See, however, note 17.

⁷¹ E.g. Dirk Heirbaut, *Over heren, vazallen en graven. Het persoonlijk leenrecht in Vlaanderen, ca. 1000-1305*, (Brussels: Algemeen rijksarchief, 1997); Dirk Heirbaut, *Over lenen en families. Een studie over de vroegste geschiedenis van het zakelijk leenrecht in het graafschap Vlaanderen* (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie, 2000) (Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie van België voor wetenschappen en kunsten, new series, II).

⁷² E.g. Steven Vanderputten, *Een heilig volk is geboren. Opkomst en ondergang van een christelijke staatsideologie uit de vroege middeleeuwen (c. 750-900)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2001), who goes much farther in interpreting his sources than Ganshof would have liked.

⁷³ Cf. Adriaan Verhulst, 'Nécrologie: François Louis Ganshof', in *Le moyen âge*, LXXXVI (1986, 1980), 534.

⁷⁴ For brevity's sake, only two are mentioned here, in their English version: Raoul Van Caenegem, *An historical introduction to private law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Raoul Van Caenegem, *An historical introduction to Western constitutional law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

⁷⁵ See about ministerials in Lotharingia, a.o. Ary Leo Peter Buitelaar, *De Stichtse ministerialiteit en de ontginningen van de Utrechtse Vechtstreek* (Hilversum: Gouda Quint, 1993); Johanna Maria Van Winter, *Ministerialiteit en ridderschap in Gelre en Zutphen* (Arnhem: Fibula van Dishoeck, 1962).

⁷⁶ References to their works, can be found in the bibliography of Dirk Heirbaut, *Heren*.

⁷⁷ See Dirk Heirbaut, 'De grafelijke leenhoven in Vlaanderen: hun ontstaan en hun vroegste ontwikkeling', in *Prevenier*, ed. by Walter and Augustyn, Beatrijs, *De Vlaamse instellingen tijdens het Ancien Régime: recent onderzoek in nieuw perspectief* (Brussels: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 1999), pp. 41-58.

tions and Flemish history are still used a lot by foreigners, though this is mainly due to a language problem, much of the new literature not being available in other languages than Dutch. Another fact is that, although a great collective work about Flemish institutions has been published⁷⁸, as a short synthesis Ganshof's general articles about Flemish institutions are still so good, that authors who have to deal with this subject like Lambrecht and Van Rompaey⁷⁹, or Heirbaut⁸⁰, have tried to reconcile their articles with his, estimating that it was impossible to improve the great master.

Ganshof's legacy as a historian of feudalism also reveals the longevity of his great syntheses. All of the central tenets of the classic historians of feudalism have in recent years been overturned: the High Middle Ages were not the golden age of feudalism, because a feudal society never existed, many so-called feudal institutions, like feudal aids, not being feudal at all; feudalism as such only broke through later than Ganshof and his contemporaries thought, its rise being linked to the centralisation in the emerging kingdoms of Europe and thus, it was not a centrifugal element, but an instrument of the prince's power: feudal order instead of feudal anarchy. All this was directed against the old historians of feudalism in general (an introduction to these new ideas about feudalism can be found in Susan Reynold's *Fiefs and vassals*)⁸¹, but specifically 'anti-Ganshofian' were complaints about the 'Belgocentrism' in the study of feudalism⁸² and the new claim that the 'South', i.e. the mediterranean world, instead of being the periphery, was the real heartland of feudalism⁸³. Undoubtedly, much of the anti-Ganshof criticism is justified. For example, the reproach of Belgocentrism in Ganshof's work is not without reason. To Ganshof, the feudalism *par excellence* was to be found between Loire and Rhine, and more specifically in Flanders and Lotharingia⁸⁴. Anyone looking at a map cannot but realise that these two territories amount to some kind of greater Belgium. Yet, some of Ganshof's critics have not been much better, as they emulated, not corrected, his mistakes, by exchanging his 'belgocentrism' for radical 'meridionalism'⁸⁵. Many of the sources from Flanders and Lotharingia which Ganshof used, are absent in the works of his critics. Even such a well-known text as the 1127 homage and fealty done by the Flemish vassals to William Clito, in the description of Galbert of Bruges, is neglected by them⁸⁶. Recent surveys of feudalism sometimes

⁷⁸Walter Prevenier en *De gewestelijke en lokale overheidsinstellingen in Vlaanderen tot 1795*, ed. by Beatrijs Augustyn (Brussels: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 1997).

⁷⁹Daniël Lambrecht en Jan Van Rompay, 'De staatsinstellingen in het Zuiden van de 11de tot de 14de eeuw', in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 1777-1983* (Haarlem: Fibula van Dishoeck, 1982), III, pp. 77-134.

⁸⁰Dirk Herbaut, 'Le cadre juridique. Institutions et droit en Flandre vers 1302', in, *1302. Le désastre de Courtrai*, ed. by R. Van Caenegem (Antwerp: Mercatorfondss, 2002), pp. 106-139.

⁸¹Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and vassals. The medieval evidence reinterpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

⁸²Robert Fossier, *L'enfance de l'Europe* (Paris : PUF, 1982), I, p.443.

⁸³E.g., Pierre Bonnassie, *La Catalogne du milieu du Xe à la fin du XIe siècle* (Toulouse : Association des publications de l'université de Toulouse-le-Mirail, 1975), p.736: "Sans pousser trop loin le paradoxe, on pourrait soutenir que les institutions majeures de la féodalité <<classique>> ont été définies dans les pays du Midi."

⁸⁴*Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, 15 (1982 édition).

⁸⁵For the word, see e.g. Dominique Barthélemy, 'Nouvelle contribution au débat sur l'an mil en France', in *Les origines de la féodalité. Hommage à Claudio Sánchez Albornoz* (Madrid : Casa de Velázquez, 2000), p. 96.

⁸⁶Cf. Dirk Heirbaut, *Not European feudalism, but Flemish feudalism. A new reading of Galbert of Bruges' data on feudalism in the context of early twelfth century Flanders* (forthcoming).

even 'forget' the crucial area between Loire and Rhine⁸⁷. One may suspect that one reason is, that the sources from this region are still closer to the Ganshofian model than to the new theories⁸⁸. Anyway, anyone wanting to study feudalism in the Loire-Rhine region still has to take up Ganshof, because his critics have not really offered an alternative to him there. This is also true in general. The new historians of feudalism have been very good at tearing down the beautiful structure Ganshof made of feudalism, but they have, up to now, been unable to put something new in its place, a new synthesis, which can stand the comparison with the simplicity and clarity of Ganshof's *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*. At least, a beginning student is still better off reading Ganshof than his critics. Like them, he will only give a glimpse of a more complex reality, but, at least, he has the advantage of not leaving one confused.

For Carolingian studies, Ganshof's memory is hindered by the lack of his great book, but even if he had written it, it would now have been something of the past. Ganshof's extreme fidelity to the sources would have made his work incomplete in our eyes, as it would be lacking some dimensions. The 'sociology of power'⁸⁹ which is so predominant in recent studies, would have been anathema to Ganshof. However, this means most of all that Ganshof's Carolingian publications nowadays can be seen as being incomplete, rather than wrong. This is most of all true for Ganshof's study of the *capitularia*, which is still indispensable, although it cannot be read without looking at more recent studies like the ones from Hubert Mordek⁹⁰ or Bühler⁹¹. Recent historiography also seems to agree with Ganshof in his ideas about Charlemagne's failure and his more positive evaluation of Louis the Pious⁹². Thus, whereas the new historians of feudalism are antagonistic to Ganshof, the new historians of the Carolingian era seem to be complementary.

Conclusion

In 2002 an article was published about multiple vassalage⁹³, fundamentally criticising an article by Ganshof, written in 1929⁹⁴, more than seventy years earlier, and

⁸⁷ E.g. Reynolds' (see note 81) beautiful book or the latest (and very impressive) synthesis in French on feudalism [*Les féodalités*, ed. by Eric Bournazel and Jean-Pierre Pley (Paris: PUF, 1998)].

⁸⁸ Cf. Dirk Heirbaut, *Galbert of Bruges*.

⁸⁹ See e.g. Janet Nelson, "Kingship and royal government", in *The new Cambridge medieval history* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), II, pp. 383-430.

⁹⁰ Hubert Mordek, *Studien zur fränkischen Herrschergesetzgebung. Aufsätze über Kapitularien und Kapitulariensammlungen ausgewählt zum 60. Geburtstag* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2000).

⁹¹ Arnold Bühler, 'Capitularia relecta. Studien zur Entstehung und Überlieferung der Kapitularien Karls des Großen und Ludwigs des Frommen', in *Archiv für Diplomatik*, XXXII (1986), pp.305-501.

⁹² Cf. Dirk Peter Block and Adriaan Verhulst, *Inleiding*, 20; *Charlemagne's heir. New perspectives on the reign of Louis the Pious*, ed. by Peter Godman and Roger Collins (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Peter Landau, "Ludwig der Fromme als Gesetzgeber. Das Gesetzgebungsprogramm des Kaisers am Beispiel von Verwandtenerbrecht und Verfügungsmacht" in *Festschrift für Gerd Kleinheyer zum 70. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg: CF Müller, 2001), p.371.

⁹³ Roman Deutinger, 'Seit wann gibt es Mehrfachvassalität', in *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, CXIX (2002), 78-105.

⁹⁴ 'Depuis quand a-t-on pu, en France, être vassal de plusieurs seigneurs?', in *Mélanges Paul Fournier*, (Paris: Sirey, 1929), pp. 261-270.

thereby proving that Ganshof still influences and stimulates current research. In fact, whatever the subject he wrote about, Flemish, feudal or Carolingian institutions, Ganshof's works have become classics with a long life still ahead of them.

Chronology

- 1895. Born, Bruges March 14
- 1914-1918. Lieutenant, j.g., in the Belgian Army
- 1919. Member of the Belgian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference
- 1921. Ph. D. (History)
- 1922. LL. D.
- 1923. Lecturer at Ghent University
- 1932. Full professor at Ghent University
- 1940. 1944-1945. Commander in the Belgian Army
- 1944. Publication of *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*
- 1946. Is awarded the Franqui prize,
- 1955. Publication of *Wat waren de capitularia*
- 1957. Publication of *La Flandre*
- 1961. Professor Emeritus
- 1980. Dies, Brussels June 26

Selected bibliography

1. Books

- La Belgique en 1786. Les Pays-Bas Autrichiens, les principautés de Liège et de Stavelot-Malmédy, le duché de Bouillon et leur évolution territoriale de 1713 à 1794*, in *Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique*, vol. 5 (Bruxelles: Elsevier, 1919).
- La Belgique sous la domination française (1794-1814). Les départements belges et les départements voisins au 1er janvier 1812*, in *Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique*, vol. 6 (Bruxelles: Elsevier, 1919-1932).
- La Belgique dans le Royaume des Pays-Bas (1814-1830)*, in *Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique*, vol. 7 (Bruxelles: Elsevier 1920).
- La Belgique de 1830-1839*, in *Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique*, vol. 8 (Bruxelles: Elsevier, 1920).
- Étude sur les ministérielles en Flandre et en Lotharingie*, 'Mémoires de l'académie royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres', second series, XX, (Bruxelles: Lamertin, 1926).
- Recherches sur les tribunaux de châtellenie en Flandre avant le milieu du XIII^e siècle* (Antwerp: De Sikkels, 1932).
- La Flandre sous les premiers comtes* (Bruxelles: La renaissance du livre, 1943).
- Over de stadsontwikkeling tussen Loire en Rijn gedurende de middeleeuwen* (Antwerp: Standaard, 1941; 2nd ed., 1944; Paris: PUF, 1943).
- Pages d'histoire* (Bruxelles: La grande Librairie belge, 1941; 2nd ed., 1944).
- Les destinées de l'Empire en Occident de 395 à 888*, in *Histoire générale, 1925-1938, Histoire du moyen âge*, ed. by Gustave Glotz, vol. I (Paris: PUF, 1934; 2nd ed., 1941) (with Ferdinand Lot and Christian Pfister).
- Henri Pirenne. Le maître. L'historien* (Bruxelles: Le flambeau, 1936).
- Étude sur le développement des villes entre Loire et Rhin au Moyen Age* (Paris: PUF, 1943).
- Qu'est-ce que la féodalité* (Bruxelles: Office de publicité, 1944); Later editions in french: (1947; 1957; Bruxelles: Presses universitaires de Bruxelles, 1968; Paris: Tallandier 1982); English

- translation (London: Longman, 1952; New York: Harper & Row, 1961; London/New York: Longman/Harper & Row, 1964; Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1996); Portuguese translation (Lisboa: Publicações Europa-America, 1959); German translation (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961); later editions, 1967, 1970, 1975, 1983, 1989; Spanish translation –with an Appendix by Luis de Valdeavellano– (Barcelona: Ariel, 1963); Japanese translation (Tokyo, 1968); Italian translation (Torino: Einaudi, 1989).
- Le moyen âge*, in *Histoire des relations internationales*, ed. by Pierre Renouvin, vol. 1 (Paris: Hachette; later editions, 1958, 1964, 1968); Spanish translation (Madrid: Aguilar, 1960); Italian translation (Florence: Vallecchi, 1961); English translation (New York, 1971).
- Wat waren de capitularia?* (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie, [collection: Verhandelungen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, XXII], 1955). French translation in *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 35 (1957), 33-87, 196-246; published separately (Paris: Sirey, 1958). German translation (Weimar: Böhlau, 1961).
- La Belgique Carolingienne* (Bruxelles: La renaissance du livre, 1958).
- Das Hochmittelalter. Von Bernhard von Clairvaux zu Papst Bonifatius VIII* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 1963) (Propyläen Weltgeschichte, 1960-1964, V); later editions, 1968, 1991; CD-rom version (Frankfurt: Directmedia, 1999).
- Monarchie franque (6.- 9. siècles)* (Bruxelles: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1964). Introduction bibliographique à l'histoire du droit et à l'ethnologie juridique; B, 6.
- Frankish institutions under Charlemagne*, trans. by Bryce and Mary Lyon of articles written by Ganshof (Providence: Brown University Press, 1968).
- Droit romain dans les capitulaires* (Milano: Giuffrè, 1969) (*Ius romanum medii aevi*, I, 2, b, cc, α-β).
- The Carolingians and the Frankish monarchy. Studies in Carolingian history*, transl. by Janet Sondheimer (London: Longman, 1971).
- Royaume Burgonde* (Bruxelles: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1972). Introduction bibliographique à l'histoire du droit et à l'ethnologie juridique; B, 7.
- Les institutions féodo-vassaliques* (Bruxelles: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1972). Introduction bibliographique à l'histoire du droit et à l'ethnologie juridique; B, 8.
- Le polyptique de l'abbaye de Saint-Bertin (844-859). Edition critique et commentaire*, Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, XLV, (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1975) (in collaboration with Françoise Godding-Ganshof and Antoine De Smet).

2. Articles

- This list contains only a selection of articles by François Louis Ganshof. For a complete bibliography of his articles, see Raoul van Caenegem, *Bibliografie Prof. Dr. F.L. Ganshof*, in 'Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Jaarboek', (1980), 241-251.
- 'De middeleeuwen', in *De pelgrimstocht der mensheid, 1925-1938*, ed. by Jan Berkelbach van der Sprenkel (Utrecht: De Haan, 1937), pp. 170-288; new editions in 1940, 1948, 1952, 1960.
- 'Note sur la compétence des cours féodales en France', in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne* (Bruxelles: Vromant, 1926), pp. 161-170.
- 'Contribution à l'étude des origines des cours féodales en France', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4th series, 7 (1928), 1-20.
- 'La Tractoria. Contribution à l'étude des origines du droit de gîte', *Tijdschrift voor rechts-geschiedenis*, 8 (1928), 69-91.
- 'Depuis quand a-t-on pu, en France, être vassal de plusieurs seigneurs?', in *Mélanges Paul Fournier* (Paris: Sirey, 1929), 261-270.
- 'Etude sur le faussement de jugement dans le droit flamand des XII^e et XIII^e siècles', *Bulletin de la commission royale des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique*, 14 (1935), 115-140.

- 'Staatkundige geschiedenis. XII^e, XIII^e, XIV^e eeuw. De staatsinstellingen van Vlaanderen en Brabant', in *Geschiedenis van Vlaanderen*, ed. by Robert Van Roosbroeck, 1936-1949, II (Brussels: Standaard, 1937), pp. 9-188.
- 'Note sur les origines de l'union du bénéfice avec la vassalité', in *Études d'histoire dédiées à la mémoire de Henri Pirenne* (Bruxelles: Nouvelle société d'édition, 1937), pp. 173-190.
- 'Tets over Brugge gedurende de preconstitutioneele periode van haar geschiedenis', *Nederlandsche historiebladen*, 1 (1938), 281-303.
- 'Die Rechtsprechung des gräflichen Hofgerichtes in Flandern bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, 68 (1938), pp. 163-177.
- 'Mediaeval agrarian society in its prime. France, the Low Countries and Western Germany', in *Cambridge economic history of Europe*, 1941-1977, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941), pp. 278-322; repr. in 1942; separately printed with biographical additions (Wetteren: De Meester, 1947); new edition, in collaboration with Adriaan Verhulst (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966).
- 'L'échec de Charlemagne', *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances*, (1947), pp. 248-254.
- 'La fin du règne de Charlemagne. Une décomposition', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte*, 28 (1948), pp. 533-552.
- 'Het falen van Karel de Grote', *Verslag der algemene vergadering der leden van het historisch genootschap gehouden te Utrecht*, (1948), 26-46.
- 'Het tijdperk van de Merovingen. Het tijdperk van de Karolingen. Het laat-Karolingisch tijdperk', in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, 1949-1958, vol. 1 (Utrecht: De Haan, 1949), pp. 252-366.
- 'Charlemagne', *Speculum*, 24 (1949), pp. 520-527.
- 'Le roi de France en Flandre en 1127 et 1128', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4th series, 27 (1949), 204-228.
- 'Les origines du concept de souveraineté nationale en Flandre', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 18 (1950), 135-158.
- 'Le droit urbain en Flandre au début de la première phase de son histoire', in *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 19 (1951), 387-416.
- 'Charlemagne et le serment', in *Mélanges dédiées à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris: PUF, 1951), pp. 259-270.
- 'Le droit urbain en Flandre au début de la première phase de son histoire (1127)', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 19 (1951), 387-416.
- L'origine des rapports féodo-vassaliques: les rapports féodo-vassaliques dans la monarchie franque au nord des Alpes à l'époque carolingienne', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 1 (1954), pp. 3-45.
- 'Les relations féodo-vassaliques aux temps post-carolingiens', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 2 (1955), pp. 67-114.
- 'Het statuut van de vreemdeling in het Frankische Rijk', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, 18,3 (1956); revised French translation in *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 10 (1958).
- 'Louis the Pious reconsidered', *History*, 42 (1957), 171-180.
- 'La Flandre', in *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge*, ed. by Ferdinand Lot and Robert Fawtier, 1957-1962, I (Paris: 1957), pp. 343-426.
- 'L'immunité dans la monarchie franque', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 1 (2nd ed. Bruxelles: G. Van Campenhout, 1958), pp. 171-216.
- 'Les liens de vassalité dans la monarchie franque', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 1 (2nd ed. Bruxelles: G. Van Campenhout, 1958), pp. 153-169.
- 'Quelques aspects principaux de la vie économique dans la monarchie franque au VII^e siècle', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 5 (1958), pp. 73-101.
- 'Note sur le premier traité anglo-flamand de Douvres', in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de*

- Raymond Monier (Lille: Faculté des Lettres, 1958), pp. 245-257 (with Raoul Ch. van Caenegem and Adriaan Verhulst).
- 'Het tolwezen in het Frankische rijk onder de Merowingen. Het tolwezen in het Frankische rijk onder de Karolingen', *Mededelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie van wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten, Klasse der Letteren*, 20, 4 and 21,1 (1958-1959).
- 'Aantekening over de betekenis van 'adheriter' en 'erven' in enkele veertiende eeuwse oorkonden afkomstig uit Vlaanderen', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 28 (1960), 348-359.
- 'De internationale betrekkingen van het Frankisch rijk onder de Merowingen', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, 22, 4 (1960).
- 'L'église et le pouvoir royal dans la monarchie franque sous Pépin III et Charlemagne', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 7 (1960), pp. 95-141.
- 'Over Robrecht de Fries en Alexios Comnenos', *Handelingen der koninklijke Zuidnederlandse maatschappij voor taal- en letterkunde en geschiedenis*, 14 (1960), 145-160; French revised translation, *Byzantion*, 31 (1961).
- 'Droit romain dans le Liber Floridus', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 29 (1961), 432-444.
- 'Recherches sur le lien juridique qui unissait les chefs de la première croisade à l'empereur byzantin', in *Mélanges offerts à M. Paul-E. Martin par ses amis, ses collègues, ses élèves* (1961), pp. 49-61.
- 'Les relations extérieures de la monarchie franque sous les premiers souverains carolingiens', *Annali di storia del Diritto*, 5-6 (1961-1962), 1-53.
- 'Les traits généraux du système d'institutions de la monarchie franque', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 9 (1962), pp. 91-127.
- 'La paix au très haut moyen âge', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 14/1 (1962), pp. 397-413.
- 'Le statut de la femme dans la monarchie franque', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 12 (1962), pp. 5-58.
- 'De internationale betrekkingen van het Frankisch rijk onder de Karolingen', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, 25, 2 (1963).
- 'Bruges au moyen âge', *Congrès archéologique de France. CXX^e session. Flandre* (Paris: 1964), pp. 12-15.
- 'Les traités des rois mérovingiens', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 32 (1964), pp. 163-192.
- 'Charlemagne et les institutions de la monarchie franque. Charlemagne et l'administration de la justice dans la monarchie franque', in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben* (Düsseldorf, 1965), I, pp. 349-419.
- 'Note sur une charte de Thierry d'Alsace, Comté de Flandre, intéressant la propriété foncière à Saint-Omer', *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Stadtgeschichte* (1965), pp. 84-96.
- 'The impact of Charlemagne on the institutions of the Frankish realm', *Speculum*, 40 (1965), pp. 47-62.
- 'La preuve dans le droit franc', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 17/2 (1965), pp. 71-98.
- 'Note sur les Capitula de causis cum episcopis et abbatibus tractandis de 811', *Studia Gratiana*, 13 (1967), pp. 1-25.
- 'L'épreuve de la croix dans le droit de la monarchie franque', *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni*, 38 (1967), pp. 217-231.
- 'Een kijk op het regeringsbeleid van Lodewijk de Vrome tijdens de jaren 814 tot 830', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, 29/2 (1967).
- 'Note sur la preuve dans la procédure en cas de flagrant délit en droit franc', in *Miscellanea mediaevalia in memoriam Jan Frederik Niermeyer* (Groningen: Wolters, 1967), pp. 11-16.
- 'L'armée sous les Carolingiens', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 15 (1968), pp. 109-130.
- Op de vooravond van de eerste crisis in het regeringsbeleid van het Frankische rijk onder

Lodewijk de Vrome, de jaren 828 en 829', *Bijdragen en mededelingen van het historisch genootschap*, 82 (1968), pp. 11-34; German revised translation, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 6 (1972).

'L'historiographie dans la monarchie franque sous les Mérovingiens et les Carolingiens. Monarchie franque unitaire et Francie Occidentale', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 17/2 (1970), pp. 631-685.

3. Ganshof in memoriams and biographies

Bibliographie des travaux historiques de François-Louis Ganshof, (Wetteren: impr. De Meester, 1946).

Theo Luyks, 'Frans-L. Ganshof', in *Rijksuniversiteit te Gent. Liber memorialis 1913-1960* (Ghent: Rectoraat Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, 1960), pp. 245-253.

Léopold Genicot, 'Décès. Ganshof et Lemarignier', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 85 (1980), 658-661.

John Gilissen, 'In memoriam Frans L. Ganshof 1895-1980', in *Bulletin de la commission royale des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique*, 30 (1980-1981), v-viii.

Stephan Kuttner, 'Nachrufe. François Louis Ganshof 14.3.1895-26.7.1980', *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Jahrbuch*, (1981), 217-223.

Archibald Lewis, Robert Lopez and Bryce Lyon, 'François L. Ganshof', *Speculum*, 56 (1981), 695-696.

Heinz Löwe, 'Nachruf. François Louis Ganshof', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 30 (1981), 939-941.

Jos Marechal, 'In memoriam François-Louis Ganshof', *Handelingen van het genootschap voor geschiedenis te Brugge*, 118 (1981), 135-136.

Ludo Milis, 'Necrologie: François-Louis Ganshof', *Belgisch tijdschrift voor filologie en geschiedenis*, 59 (1981), 518-528.

Wilfried Pauwels, *De bevrijdingsdagen van 1944: de geheime rapporten van François Louis Ganshof* (Antwerp: De Nederlanden, 1994).

Adriaan Verhulst, 'Nécrologie: François Louis Ganshof', *Le moyen âge*, 86 (1980), 523-538.

Raoul Van Caenegem, 'In memoriam F.L. Ganshof (14 maart 1895- 26 juli 1980) Bibliografie Prof. Dr. F.L. Ganshof', *Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Jaarboek*, (1980), 231-251.

Raoul Ch. Van Caenegem, 'In memoriam F.L. Ganshof (1895-1980)', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 49 (1981), 5-12.

Cinzio Violante, 'Ricordi Spoletini di François-Louis Ganshof e di Jean-François Lemarignier', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 5/1 (1983), pp. 67-71.

Raoul Van Caenegem, 'Ganshof, François Louis, mediëvist en rechtshistoricus, hoogleraar', in *Nationaal biografisch woordenboek*, XII, (Brussels: 1987), pp. 263-274.

Ugo Sesini (1899–1945)

Antoni ROSSELL

(Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Selecting a musical historian and medievalist from among the more important figures of the 20th century would be a simple task if choice were limited solely to those researchers who have become more celebrated, or those who devoted their research to “discovering” hitherto unpublished documents. Either choice would deserve to be the protagonist of this paper. I have opted, however, for a musicologist who expounded his revolutionary theories of renewal at a time when musicology was repeating traditional postulates and had little time for any kind of innovation. Ugo Sesini (1899–1945) was an innovator both for his research work and his new methodological proposals. His revolutionary theories on the rhythm of monodic troubadour melodies, his musical editions which were a model of their kind, and a school of thought that continues his comparative studies of Romance and medieval Latin lyrics have proved to be areas of sufficient merit to grant him the status of protagonist of this paper. The latter not only attempts to highlight his personality but also to make his work better known and to place it in a special position when compared with that of the musicologists of his time, a life’s work which only specialists in medieval monodic music are aware of today.

In addition to our protagonist, the Italian musicologist Ugo Sesini, we cannot fail to mention Hans Spanke, Friedrich Ludwig, Friedrich Gennrich, Higiní Anglès and Jacques Chailley, among others, in this paper. We shall not address the work of those musicologists who have devoted their studies to the world of polyphony, and we do so consciously and deliberately, for in this repertory the interaction between text and music is relegated to secondary importance. Among these we have musicologists of the stature of Willi Apel, the author of *The Harvard Dictionary of Music*¹, and numerous studies on polyphony and Gregorian chant. Another of the repertories to which numerous musicologists have devoted their researches and which we cannot address here, both for reasons of space and for the sheer number of publications, is that of medieval liturgy. Among these we may cite Egon Wellesz, who devoted a lifetime’s study to Byzantine liturgy. In the field of Gregorian music the list of worthies is an extensive one and we shall merely cite Dom Gregori Suñol in the field of Gregorian palaeography, Dom Joseph Pothier as the instigator of the revival studies of Gregorian melodies in the Abbey of Solesmes in the face of many

¹ 1944-1969, and later re-editions (Cambridge, Massachusetts).

trials², Dom André Mocquereau and the Gregorian restoration, Dom Eugène Cardine with his pioneering and revealing studies of Gregorian semiology, which have proved decisive for articulating a rhythmic alternative to medieval profane monody, or Willi Apel himself with his study of Gregorian chant.

A biographical note

Ugo Sesini was born on 19 January 1899, in Trapani (Sicily), and was the youngest of the four children of an army general who originally hailed from Verona. He had his primary and secondary schooling in Verona and Venice and it was in the latter that he met the *Padri Mechitaristi* and came into contact with the liturgical chant of the ancient Armenian Church. At the age of fourteen he received from Padre Leone a manual devoted to the chants of the aforementioned Eastern Church, which influenced his dedication to medieval musicology in general, and liturgical music in particular. At the age of sixteen he obtained his piano diploma from the G. B. Martini Musical Academy in Bologna and became an *accademico* in the city's Philharmonic orchestra.

Between 1921 and 1924 he resided in Rome, where he obtained his degree in Arts, and studied in the *Istituto Pontificio di Musica Sacra*, under the direction of Abbé P. Ferretti, obtaining his *Licenza Gregoriana*. In 1930 he became a lecturer in Liturgical Chant in the *Scuola Superiore d'Arte Cristiana "Beato Angelico"* in Milan and it was during these years that he began to expound those particular views on musical teaching that clashed with the traditional postulates of the Conservatories of his day. 1931 proved to be an important year in his professional career as a researcher, as he made a visit to the Abbey of Solesmes in France, where he studied pneumatic notation, and this resulted in a study, published in 1932, of the musical notation of the *Codex Ambrosiano E. 68 Sup* from the Como region of Italian. In 1933, within the same repertoire, he published *Decadenza e Restaurazione del Canto Liturgico*, a diachronic study of Gregorian chant.

In 1932 he qualified to teach History and Musical Palaeography at University, and the following year found him in the University of Bologna lecturing on Gregorian Chant. From 1939 to 1943, coinciding with the Second World War, he lived in Naples as a Lecturer in the University there and as Librarian in the Conservatory of San Pietro in Maiella. In 1942 he published different studies of Gregorian chant: *La Romana Cantinela (Corso completo storico, didattico, critico di Canto*

² According to Chailley, "L'histoire de la "réforme" à laquelle Solesmes a attaché son nom, et dont *Les mélodies grégoriennes* constitue l'un des pivots, a été publié en 1969 par dom Pierre Combe, *Histoire de la restauration du chant grégorien d'après des documents inédits* (Solesmes, 1969) ; avec une parfaite objectivité et une grande abondance de documents et de précisions. On reste effondré devant l'inextricable lacs d'intrigues, d'embûches, de volte-face, de coups fourrés, auquel dut faire face, de leur vallée isolée de la Sarthe, une petite équipe de moines aux prises avec les forces redoutables de trois siècles au moins de décadence routinière, d'idées reçues et d'intérêts financiers menacés; et cela au milieu des séquelles de la guerre de 70, des persécutions politiques (les moines de Solesmes durent l'année même de la publication de *Mélodies grégoriennes* s'exiler en Angleterre) et des querelles religieuses de la fin du siècle". Cf. in Joseph Pothier, *Les Mélodies grégoriennes*, introduction by Jacques Chailley, (1e éd. Tournay: Impr. de Saint-Jean-l'Évangéliste, 1880; Stock : 1980), pp. 14 - 15.

(*Gregoriano*) and the *Epistola de Ignotu cantu*, in which he commented on the aesthetic processes informing the interpretation of the Gregorian repertoire.

In 1942 he brought out *Le melodie trobadoriche nel Canzoniere Provenzale della Biblioteca Ambrosiana* (R. 71 Sup.), a work in which –in contrast to the theories of modal interpretation in vogue among the scholars of the day– he advocated that the key to interpreting the melodic rhythm of non-liturgical medieval monody lay in the poetic text, just as in the liturgical repertory, and following the postulates of Solesmes. In 1943, due to the difficulties caused by the Second World War, he left Naples and returned to Trevenzuolo (Verona) to be near his family, forming part of the *Comitato di Liberazione* in neighbouring Isola della Scala.

On the night of 22 November 1944, he was arrested along with the other members of the *Comitato di Liberazione*. After the fruitless mediation of, among others, Cardinal Schuster, on 12 December 1944, Sesini was deported to the Nazi death camp of Mauthausen. Towards mid-February 1945 news reached Mauthausen that the Russian army was slowly approaching. Sesini organised a choir to welcome the liberators, but he died the day before the death camp could be liberated. On 27 February his name was “removed” from the “provisions” list for detainees³.

Sesini's innovations in contemporary musicology

Sesini's importance as a researcher lies in his ground-breaking approach to the application of a new method of musicological interpretation and his interdisciplinary capacities, which led him to conclusions that his contemporaries would take years to accept and which would later be unanimously admitted. Sesini's epistemological approach was one that was considerably ahead of its time. The question that requires addressing is why his contemporaries took so long –twenty five years– to accept his conclusions and recognise his merits, despite their awareness of his work. To this end, I propose to examine his work and that of his contemporaries in order to compare musicological studies of medieval Latin lyric, above all the troubadour lyric, which were fields in which his work has proved decisive both for musicology and philology. Sesini's research work can be divided into four parts: liturgical music, musicology and philology, courtly troubadour monody and other publications (see the bibliographic section).

As we have already noted in commenting on his publications, Sesini approached the question of monodic troubadour rhythm from an interdisciplinary perspective: text and music. In this sense the metrics of the troubadour text is interdependent on the musical rhythm, not only from a syntagmatic perspective (the rhythm of the melody of the verse) but also from a paradigmatic one, which conceives the strophe as a rhythmic unit.

The transcription system employed by the musicologists of the day was a rhythmic system founded on the modal theory formulated by Aubry and Beck, which proposed a possible application of ternary rhythmic formulas in which the *longa* and *brevis* values would be alternated. Sesini's response to this hypothesis was that the application of the rhythm to polyphonic texts responds to the need to articulate the

³ Biographical data taken from P. Ferrarini and U. Saragiotto, 1995.

simultaneous nature of the different voices, and to fix the values of each one of the notes of the different melodies by the performers which does not occur in monodic melody⁴. Sesini brings out the numerous contradictions in those who defended the modal transcription system, such as the incoherence of a rhythm that has little connection with the palaeography of the manuscripts, or the inability to undertake a musical transcription that in its interpretation does not destroy the prosody of the text. To this must be added the anachronism involved in the application of a rhythmic system of a later polyphonic repertoire to another, earlier monodic one, with all the aesthetic problems or problems of musical conception that this gives rise to⁵.

Sesini approaches the rhythmic issue from a musical and poetic stance: the poetic and metrical, the musical and rhythmic. He conceives the rhythm as a binary and ternary combination according to the prosodic rhythm of the verse and, given that the latter changes with each strophe, he was of the opinion that it would not be logical to impose a similar rhythmic sequence for all the strophes. His proposal derives from a comparison between the troubadour and liturgical repertoires, which he considers to be the musical precedent for troubadour courtly music.

The novelty in Sesini's approach contrasts not only with that of his contemporaries but also with later musicologists, who took over twenty years to accept his hypotheses. In the years in which Sesini undertook his research work, a German researcher, Friedrich Gennrich, also approached the study of troubadour monody and began to investigate the origins of melody⁶. Like Sesini, in 1918 the German musicologist had put forward the comparative study of musicology and philology⁷ which would later give rise to the study of metrical-melodic imitation or *contrafactum*, above all of Latin models⁸, which he was to develop from the 50s and 60s onwards⁹.

The problem of rhythm and its transcription in troubadour melodies was not directly addressed by Gennrich until 1954¹⁰ but in his work devoted to the troubadours dated in 1958 – 1960, Gennrich continued to transcribe in modal rhythm¹¹. A special case is illustrated by the Catalan musicologist Higiní Anglès, as the latter systematically investigated the repertoire of monodic troubadour music in the 30s

⁴ Ugo Sesini, *Le melodie trobadoriche del canzoniere provenzale della Biblioteca Ambrosiana (R 71 sup.)*. Studio, traduzione in note moderne, edición y facsímil (Torino: Chiantone, 1942), pp. 2-11.

⁵ For a detailed explanation of Sesini's rhythmic conception, see Sesini, 1942: 2 - 11 and Capuccio *Le strategie metrico-melodiche delle Cantigas de Santa Maria*, Degree dissertation (Directed by A. Rossell), (Barcelona: Autonomous University of Barcelona, 2002).

⁶ Friedrich Gennrich, 'Internationale mittelalterliche Melodien', *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, 11 (1928-1929), 259-96, 321-48.

⁷ Friedrich Gennrich, *Musikwissenschaft und romanische Philologie* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1918).

⁸ Friedrich Gennrich, 'Lateinische Kontrafakta altfranzösischer Lieder', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 50 (1930), 187-207.

⁹ 'Lateinische Liedkontrafaktur: Eine Auswahl lateinischer Conductus mit ihren volkssprachigen Vorbildern', ed. by Friedrich Gennrich, *Musikwissenschaftliche Studien-Bibliothek*, Darmstadt, 11 (1956) and 'Die Kontrafaktur im Liedschaffen des Mittelalters', ed. by Friedrich Gennrich, *Summa Musicae Medii Aevi*, 12 (1965).

¹⁰ Friedrich Gennrich, 'Grundsätzliches zur Rhythmik der mittelalterlichen Melodie', *Musikforschungen*, VII/2 (1954), 150-176.

¹¹ Friedrich Gennrich, *Der musikalische Nachlass der Troubadours* (Darmstadt: Summa Musicae Medii Aevi III and IV, 1958-1960).

along with Friedrich Ludwig (who was also Gennrich's teacher), systematically applying the modal transcription system. In 1943 he reconsidered the transcription system that Ludwig had taught him, but finally returned to the modal transcription system at the end of the fifties, influenced by his mensural theories on the notation of the music of the Cantigas de Santa María.¹² If we review Anglès' publications we can see that his earliest researches begin with the monodic liturgical repertoire, in particular the Cant de la Sibila and the traditional Catalan repertoire. Anglès was a pupil of Pedrell, the father of Catalan and nationalist musicology.

In 1926 Anglès published the transcription of the work of the troubadour Guiraut Riquier and from here onwards he combined the musicological studies of various periods, *genres* and styles. Monodic music stands out in a production as vast as that of Anglès, above all for the study of the music of the Cantigas de Santa María. In the publication of his extensive study of this Alfonsine Marian *corpus* he also included transcriptions of troubadour courtly music¹³ but his studies of monodic notation (aside from that of the Cantigas de Santa María) were published in 1949 and 1961.¹⁴

In the manuscript transcriptions of troubadour music made by Anglès himself we find him noting down his doubts on the transcription of the rhythm¹⁵, and he goes so far as to combine binary and ternary rhythms without reaching a solution or a system capable of being applied systematically to all melodies. Anglès –based on his own notes– appears destined in favour of free rhythm. However, he proves incapable of freeing himself from the modal transcription system, perhaps from his hypothesis (much argued over and arguable) based on the rhythmic transcription of the music of the Cantigas de Santa María. We know that Sesini's work formed part of the books in Anglès' own library, but it is clear that the work of the Italian musicologist did not excite the sympathies of his Catalan counterpart. Whether because of his contacts with Italian musicology or the research work by Sesini published in scientific reviews, Anglès must have known of the latter's life and work. We cannot know what motives Anglès had for ignoring Sesini's research and innovative hypotheses, but it appears that there was a solid group of musicologists trained in the Germanic tradition under Ludwig (Gennrich and Anglès among them) who were of a more traditional bent, in contrast with a much more practical musicology that stemmed from the liturgical repertoire.

¹² Antoni Rossell, 'Algunos aspectos sobre las transcripciones musicales de las Cantigas de Santa María de Alfonso X realizadas por Higinio Anglès', in *Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre la Lengua y la Literatura en tiempos de Alfonso X*, March, 1984, (Murcia: Facultad de Letras de la Universidad de Murcia, 1985), pp. 519-530.

¹³ (Anglès 1958, vol. III/2): Higinio Anglès (1943-64), *La música de las Cantigas de Santa María del rey Alfonso el Sabio*; vol. I, *Facsimil del códice j.b.2 del Escorial* (1964); vol. II, *Transcripción musical* (1943); vol. III/1, *Estudio crítico: Die Metrik der Cantigas, Abhandlung von Haus Spanke* (1958); vol. III/2, *Las melodías Hispanas y la monodía lírica Europea ss. XII-XIII* (1958). Barcelona, Servei de Publicacions de la Diputació de Barcelona.

¹⁴ Higinio Anglès, 'Der Rhythmus der monodischen Lyrik des Mittelalters und seine Probleme', in *Kongress-Bericht Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft* (Basel: 1949), 45-50; Higinio Anglès, 'Der Rhythmus in der Melodik mittelalterlicher Lyrik', in *Report of the 8th Congress New York 96, Bärenreiter I*, (Kassel: 1962), pp. 3-11; II, 1963, 43-47.

¹⁵ Antoni Rosell, *Monodia Cortesana Trovadoresca. Seixanta-quatre transcripcions inèdites de Mn. Higinio Anglès* (Barcelona: Servei de Publicacions de l'Exc. Diputació de Barcelona, Dept. de Música de la Biblioteca de Catalunya, 1986).

To the name of Anglès must be added that of Hans Spanke, who dedicated himself body and soul to Romance metrics and their relationship to, or inheritance from, medieval Latin metrics. Spanke being an outstanding figure in medieval musicology for his epistemological clarity in eliminating the barriers between Latin and Romance verse, his influence in the world of philology is known above all in the field of Marian metrics for his metrical study of the *Cantigas de Santa María*, which he undertook for Anglès, but his interesting studies of metrical imitation and the *contrafacta* in medieval music and literature are lesser known.

Another of the musicologists who stood out in medieval musicological research was the frenchman Jacques Chailley, twenty years younger than Sesini, who has become one of the indisputable reference points in French and European musicology. His work on Gautier de Coinci, on the origins of Romance and troubadour music, on the musical school of Saint-Martial de Limoges, or on the histories of medieval music, are a fine example of his importance and standing¹⁶, and above all in the volume entitled: *Histoire de la Musique de la Pléiade* (Paris: gaillimard 1981) we find only marginal references to the polemic involving monodic rhythm, and Chailley does not deal with it in any depth. The former work deals exclusively with the modal theory of Aubry¹⁷. The latter obviates the problem in a somewhat evasive manner. Chailley, who is involved in the chapter on troubadour and trouvère tropes (*La musique post-grégorienne*, pp. 719 – 780), deals almost exclusively with literary questions. In the section devoted to post-Gregorian music and the troubadours, in one note in brackets we encounter a reference via one single seven-line mention of Ludwig, Aubry and Beck, in which a certain doubt is expressed as to the system of modal transcription, but without any alternative being offered¹⁸. In the bibliography to this chapter we find cited the works of Beck, Aubry, Ludwig, or Chailley himself, but no mention is made of Sesini's studies or theory. Chailley was too well informed not to be aware of Sesini's work. His silence on the hypothesis of free rhythm or syllabic rhythm and the lukewarm nature of his approach to the modal system we believe obeys a premeditated strategy. In this sense Chailley appears to follow in the steps of Théodor Gérold, who in the thirties transcribed the troubadour lyric via the modal transcription system¹⁹.

The issue of rhythm was again addressed from a comparative perspective between the liturgical and courtly repertoires at the end of the fifties²⁰. Musicology would have to wait twenty years to recover both Sesini's hypotheses and his transcription

¹⁶ Gautier de Coinci, *Les Chansons à la vierge de Gautier de Coinci (1177 – 1236)*. Edition musicale critique avec introduction et commentaires par Jacques Chailley (Paris: Heugel, 1959) ; Jacques Chailley, *L'École musicale de Saint-Martial de Limoges jusqu'à la fin du XIe siècle* (Paris: Les Livres Essentiels, 1960) ; Jacques Chailley, *Histoire musicale du Moyen Âge*, [3e éd. rev., (Paris: PUF, 1984)]. It is most curious that in one of Chailley's principal works: Jacques Chailley, *Cours d'histoire de la musique*, I, *Des origines à la fin du 17e siècle* (Paris: Alphonse Leduc, cop. 1967-1990).

¹⁷ Jacques Chailley, *Cours d'histoire de la musique*, I, *Des origines à la fin du 17e siècle* (Paris : Alphonse Leduc, cop. 1967-1990), p. 35.

¹⁸ Jacques Chailley, 1981: 733.

¹⁹ Théodor Gérold, 'Les monodies lyriques sur textes en langue vulgaire', in *La musique au Moyen Âge* (Paris: champion 1932), pp. 91-215.

²⁰ Enrico Paganuzzi, 'Il problema del ritmo in nuove teorie sulla monodia liturgica ed extraliturgica medievale', *Convivium* (1958), 22-15.

system, and it is from the sixties onwards that we have numerous studies in which the rhythmic significance of monodic notation is addressed²¹.

The study of text-music relationships had to wait until the 70s (Théodor Karp)²² and in the following decade, when comparative studies between philology and musicology were taken up again (F.B. Machabey)²³. We have to wait until the work of Nicolas Ruwet – from the sixties onwards – and of Jean-Jacques Nattiez – in the seventies – to find theoretical argumentation elaborated on the basis of text-music relationships founded on structuralism and semiology.²⁴

Modal theory, in spite of all the published bibliography and criticism received, remains present in the transcription of some *soi-disant* rhythmic repertoires, such as that of the trouvères, and there were still works in 1977 insisting on modal theory as a method of rhythmic transcription²⁵.

We have to come down to the late 60s-70s to encounter the studies of Van der Werf, which systematically apply free or syllabic rhythm²⁶. In 1983 appeared the study of Jorn Gruber, that laid down the bases for a genuine comparative philological and musicological study based on the concept of imitation and intertextuality²⁷.

By way of conclusion

What separates Sesini from the musicologists who defended modal rhythmic theses was his starting-off point and training. Sesini started from a Gregorian liturgical training, which gave him the keys supplied by a knowledge of the palaeography of liturgical and courtly music and, above all, a perspective that valued the “sung word” and its spread over and above any rhythmic “performance”. All of this

²¹ Samuel Arom, ‘Essai d’une notation des monodies à des fins d’analyse’, *Revue de Musicologie*, 55 (1969), 173-216.

²² Théodor Karp, ‘Interrelationships between Poetic and Musical Form in Trouvère Song’, in *Musical Offering: Essays in Honor of Martin Bernstein* (1977), 137-161.

²³ F.B. Machabey, ‘Méthodes linguistiques et musicologie’, *Musique en jeu*, 5 (1981), 75-91.

²⁴ Nicolas Ruwet, ‘Fonction de la parole dans la musique vocale’, *Revue Belge de Musicologie*, 15 (1961), 8-28 ; Nicolas Ruwet, *Langue, musique, poésie* (Paris : Éd. Du Seuil, 1972), pp. 100 – 134; Nicolas Ruwet, ‘Théorie et méthodes dans les études musicales: Quelques remarques rétrospectives et préliminaires’, *Musique en jeu*, 17 (1974), 11-36 ; Jean-Jacques Nattiez, ‘Analyse musicale et sémiologie: le structuralisme de Lévi-Strauss’, *Musique en jeu*, 12 (1973), 59-78 ; Jean-Jacques Nattiez, *Fondements d’une sémiologie de la musique* (Paris: Union Générale d’Éditions, 1976) ; Jean-Jacques Nattiez, ‘Is a Descriptive Semiotics of Music Possible?’, *Language Sciences*, 23 (1972), 1-7; Jean-Jacques Nattiez, ‘Linguistics: A new approach for musical analysis?’, *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music*, 4 (1973), 51-68.

²⁵ I. R. Parker, ‘Troubadour and trouvère song: problems in modal analysis’, *Revue Belge de Musicologie*, 31 (1977), 20-37; Hans Tischler, ‘Die rhythmische Interpretation eines Trouvèreliedes’, *Die Musikforschung*, 32 (1979), 17-25 ; Hans Tischler, ‘Rhythm, Meter and melodic organization in medieval songs’, *Revue Belge de Musicologie*, 28-30 (1974-1976), 5-23; Hans Tischler, *Trouvère Lyrics with Melodies: Complete Comparative Edition*, Corpus mensurabilis musicae, 107, N.p: American Institute of Musicology; 15 vols. (Neuhausen: Hänssler Verlag, 1997).

²⁶ Hendrik van der Werf, *The Chansons of the Troubadours and Trouvères* (Utrecht: A. Gosthoek’s, 1972) ; Hendrik van der Werf, ‘Recitative melodies in Trouvère chansons’, in *Festschrift Walter Wiora* (Kassel: Bärenreiter-Verl., 1967) ; Hendrik van der Werf, *The chansons of the Trouvères. A Study in rhythmic and melodic Analysis* (Columbia University thesis, 1967).

²⁷ Jorn Gruber, *Die Dialektik des Trobar* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1983).

served as a basic argument for abandoning the modal transcription method²⁸. Another differentiating factor for Sesini was that his aim was a practical one, which obliged him to attach greater importance to detail and to objectivity and not to allow himself to be carried away by theoretical presuppositions and rules, the fruit of speculation without any historical or musical basis. What was novel in Sesini was his approach to the origin of Romance music and metrics from a hypothesis of continuity, just as Alinei (1996) approached it for the origin of Romance languages with respect to Latin. This hypothesis, consciously or not, continued from a theoretical perspective along the path marked out by Spanke regarding metrical imitation in the medieval lyric.

We cannot bring this study to a conclusion without addressing one last question. Why did European musicology, which was aware of Sesini's relevance, condemn his work and hypotheses to silence for so long? Only in his own country and thanks to his disciples did his work remain alive. His hypotheses and research work not only remain valid but have been generally accepted.

A life cut short, but a life's work that remains.

Chronology

- 1899. Ugo Sesini is born on 19 January 1899, in Trapani (Sicily).
- 1915. He obtains his piano diploma from the G. B. Martini Musical Academy in Bologna and became an *accademico* in the city's Philharmonic orchestra
- 1921–1924. He resides in Rome, where he obtains his degree in Arts, and studies in the *Istituto Pontificio di Musica Sacra*, under the direction of Abbé PP. Ferretti, obtaining his *Licenza Gregoriana*.
- 1930. He becomes a lecturer in Liturgical Chant in the *Scuola Superiore d'Arte Cristiana 'Beato Angelico'* in Milan.
- 1931. Important year in his professional career as a researcher, as he makes a visit to the Abbey of Solesmes in France, where he studies pneumatic notation.
- 1932. He publishes a musical notation of the *Codex Ambrosiano E. 68 Sup* from the Como region of Italian.
- 1932. He qualifies to teach History and Musical Palaeography at University.
- 1933. He publishes *Decadenza e Restaurazione del Canto Liturgico*, a diachronic study of Gregorian chant.
- 1933. He teaches at the University of Bologna on Gregorian Chant.
- 1939–1943. Coinciding with the Second World War, he lives in Naples as a Lecturer in the University there and as Librarian in the Conservatory of San Pietro in Maiella.
- 1942. He publishes different studies of Gregorian chant: *La Romana Cantinela (Corso completo storico, didattico, critico di Canto (Gregoriano))* and the *Epistola de Ignotu cantu*, in which he comments on the aesthetic processes informing the interpretation of the Gregorian repertoire.
- 1943. Due to the difficulties caused by the Second World War, he leaves Naples and returned to Trevenzuolo (Verona) to be near his family, forming part of the *Comitato di Liberazione* in neighbouring Isola della Scala.

²⁸ On the non-assumption of modality prior to composition in medieval and Renaissance polyphony, see H. S. Powere, 'The Modality of vestiva i colli', in *Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Music in Honor of Arthur Mendel*, (New Jersey: Boonin, 1974), p. 31. On the extension of this conclusion to medieval monody, see I. R. Parker, 'Troubadour and Trouvère Song: Problems in Modal Analysis', *Revue Belge de Musicologie*, 31 (1977), 20–37.

22 November 1944, he is arrested on the night along with the other members of the *Comitato di Liberazione*. After the fruitless mediation of, among others, Cardinal Schuster, on 12 December 1944, Sesini was deported to the Nazi death camp of Mauthausen. Towards mid-February 1945 news reached Mauthausen that the Russian army was slowly approaching. Sesini organises a choir to welcome the liberators, but he dies the day before the death camp could be liberated. On 27 February his name was 'removed' from the 'provisions' list for detainees.

Selected bibliography

1. Liturgical music

Sesini's published works on liturgical music began with research into the Gregorian chant of Solesmes and its spread:

'Dom André Mocquereau (Necrologio)', *Arte Cristiana*, April 1930, 119-120.

'Il canto litúrgico', *Il Solco*, March 1931.

'Opus Angelorum', *Il Solco*, July 1931.

'Solesmes, rocca del canto', *L'Italia*, 16 October 1931.

Decadenza e restaurazione del Canto Litúrgico (Milano: Beato Angelico, 1933).

These are the early research studies that Sesini undertook between 1930 and 1933 and they reveal that his musicological starting point was the liturgical repertory. Work on notation in the Como region of Italy and its semiological interpretation:

La Notazione Comasa nel Codice Ambrosiano R. 68 Supp. (Milano: Beato Angelico, 1931).

Works devoted to the practical interpretation of Gregorian chant:

'Organo y Música Litúrgica', *Criterio*, 1st May 1930.

'Quelques mots sur l'accompagnement grégorien et les dissonances', *Revue Grégorienne*, May-June (1931), 131-135.

Essays on the training of liturgical singers and the teaching of liturgical chant in the conservatory. Worthy of mention – among others – is the work published in 1942 on Gregorian Chant:

'Canto litúrgico e Conservatorio', *L'Italia*, 19, 20, 24 and 30 September (1930).

'La formazione del maestro gregorianista', *L'Italia*, 24 April 1931.

'La preparazione letteraria del maestro di canto litúrgico', *Ambrosius*, November 1931.

La Romana Cantilena (Corso completo storico, didattico, critico di canto Gregoriano) (Roma: Cremonese, 1942).

The spread of liturgical chant:

'La diffusione del canto litúrgico', *L'Italia*, 11 April 1931.

This training assisted him in addressing a study published in 1942 of the pneumatic notation of Nonantola in the review *Convivium*, with which he collaborated throughout his life:

'Per la storia delle notazioni italiane: appunti sui neumi nonantolesi', *Convivium*, II (1942), 111-120.

2. Musicology and philology

This second section deals with the interdisciplinary research into Musicology and Philology that Sesini developed in a publication dated in 1937, which involves a reflection on the Occitan Romance, medieval French, and 12th- and 13th-century Italian lyric:

'Musicología e filologia (la musica nella poesia provenzale, nella poesia francese antica e nella poesia nostra del duecento e del trecento)', *Convivium*, III (1937), 306-317.

In this same section I include the 1938 publications on metrics and music issued in the review *Convivium*, outstanding among which is a comparative study between Byzantine hymnody and Romance metrics:

'Il verso neolatino nella ritmica musicale', *Convivium*, V (1938), 481-502.

'Innodia bizantiniana e metrica romanza', *Convivium*, VI (1938), 629-632.

Continuing with the Romance repertory and metrics, Sesini published studies on the hendecasyllable:

'L'endecasillabo: struttura e peculiarità', *Convivium*, V (1938), 545-570.

And on Dante, the troubadour tradition, and Veneto poetry in the Petrarchan tradition of the 14th century, the *trecento*:

'In margine alla dottrina dantesca della canzone. Rapporti fra còbra e melodia', *Studi medievali*, N.S., 11 (1938), 180-185.

'Sul *De vulgari eloquentia* edito da Aristide Marigo', *Convivium*, IV (1937), 463-472.

'Modi petrarcheschi in poesie venete musicate del trecento', in *Studi Petrarcheschi*, ed. by Carlo Calcaterra, vol. 1 (Bologna: Minerva, 1948).

This section ends with a posthumous publication undertaken by Giuseppe Vecchi –Sesini's disciple and continuator– of 12 studies on medieval music and metrics, dated in 1970:

Musicologia e filologia. Raccolta di (dodici) studi sul ritmo e sulla metrica del Medio Evo, ed. by Giuseppe Vecchi (Bologna: Forni, 1970).

3. Courtly troubadour monody

The third section corresponds to the troubadour lyric and courtly troubadour monody. Here we encounter Sesini's major *opus*, the edition, study and transcription of one of the most important manuscripts in the musical repertoire of the whole troubadour tradition:

Le melodi trobadoriche nel canzoniere provenzale della Biblioteca Ambrosiana (R 71 supp.). Studio, traduzione in note moderne, Edition and Facsimile (Torino: Chiantone, 1942).

This is the *G* (R 71) manuscript, dating from the first half of the 14th century, kept in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan, which is important both for the melodic repertoire that it contains and for the quality of the notation, in addition to the organisation of the manuscript. Although the publication of this book dates from 1942, Sesini had researched this manuscript previously on the occasion of his study of the work of the troubadour Folquet de Marseilles, with whose work the *G* manuscript begins:

'Folchetto da Marsiglia, poeta e musicista', *Convivium*, I (1938), 75-84

Previously Sesini had dealt with the melodic tradition of other troubadours such as Aimerich de Peguilhan and subsequently that of Peire Vidal:

'Sulla paternità della canzone provenzale *En greu pantais m'a tengut longament*', *Studi medievali*, N.S., 9 (1936) 232-236.

'Peire Vidal e la sua opera musicale', *La Rassegna musicale*, 2 (1943).

The edition and study of mss. *G* proved to be a revolution in musicological studies of the troubadour lyric, because of a new and interdisciplinary approach that led Sesini to rule out the modal systems of rhythmic interpretation of the troubadour lyric based on the rhythmic modes of medieval polyphony, which were so much in vogue, and remained so, until the 1970s. Sesini proposed a new manner of transcription based on a comparative system between musicology and philology. The musicologist put forward the impossibility of the system of transcription of rhythmic sequencing of the music (the modal rhythm), which was incompatible with the prosody of the text. It was necessary, therefore, to formulate a hypothesis that would reconcile both elements within one and the same concept of 'articulation', a concept in the Gregorian liturgical tradition, and this was Sesini's aim with his new transcription system based on syllabic rhythm, also termed 'free rhythm'.

In this section we cannot forget other works devoted to the practical musical interpretation of the troubadour lyric, in which Sesini was also a specialist, for his interest not only in troubadour music but music in general was a practical one, and one –as we have seen in the biographical note– that he maintained until the end of his life. I cite the works devoted to troubadour musical interpretation as follows:

'Come cantarono i maestri di Dante', *Convivium*, IV (1937), 424-430.

'Contenuto umano della lirica musicale trovadorica', *La Rassegna musicale*, 11 (1939), 458-470.

Audizione di musiche trobadoriche. Lecture, notes and translations (Napoli: Contessa e Fratelli, 1941).

Musiche Trobadoriche, in *Quaderni del R. Conservatorio di Musica di Napoli* (Napoli: Contessa, 1941), p. 56

Ventiquattro canzoni trobadoriche, estratte dal Canzoniere Provenzale, interpretate ritmicamente e armonizzate per la voce e la viola d'amore da Ugo Sensini. Trascrizione per voce e pianoforte con note e segni dinamici di Rachele Maragliano Mori (Bologna: Bongiovanni, 1948).

I add to this section a review of one of the works of Jean Beck, who together with Aubry proposed the modal interpretation of troubadour music:

Jean B. Beck, *Le melodie dei trovatori*, trad. di Gaetano Cesari (Milano: Hoepli, 1939). Reviewed in *La Rassegna musicale* (1939), 426-428; and also in *Studi medievali*, N.S., 11 (1938), 210-213.

4. Other publications

'Un ignoto esemplare dell'arte lignaria della fine del Duecento', *Arte di Adolfo Venturi*, fasc. II and III (1922), 102-104.

'Il Crocifisso dalle sue origini all'età francescana', *Rassegna d'Arte* (1922).

'Una Lauda jacononica ed alcune teorie mistiche medievali', *Fede e Vita* (1924).

'Nuova fonte per il teatro musicale', *Convivium*, III (1938), 280-285.

'Catalogo della biblioteca del liceo musicale "G. B. Martini" di Bologna', vol. 5, *Libretti D'Opera in Musica* 'La Missa Solemnis Di Beethoven', *Convivium*, IV (1939), XVII.

'La Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Nápoles in S. Pietro in Maiella', *Bollettino del Conservatorio di Musica*, Naples, November (1939), 27-33.

'Studi sull'Umanesimo Musicale: Ercole Bottrigari', *Convivium*, XIII (1941), 1-25.

'Musica del rinascimento e rinascimento musicale', *Convivium*, XIV (1942), 1-16.

'*Epistola de ignoto cantu*. A Rachele Maraglino Mori', Naples: Conservatorio di Musica, 24 May 1942; see Carlo Calcaterra, *Poesia e canto* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1951).

'Cenno sui *lieder* di Roberto Schumann', *Convivium*, Raccolta Nuova, 1 (1947), 78-82.

'Il canzoniere musicale trecentesco del cod. Vat. Rossiano 215', *Studi Medievali*, Nuova serie, 16 (1943-1950).

To bring this section on publications to a close, we should not forget to refer to Sesini's disciple, the musicologist Giuseppe Vecchi. Sesini's work cannot be discussed without reference to his disciple and the continuator of his researches, Giuseppe Vecchi. To him we owe the publication of the two works that have served to spread Sesini's work most since the 1960s:

Momenti di teoria musicale tra Medioevo e Rinascimento, ed. by Giuseppe Vecchi (Bologna: Tamari, 1966).

Musicologia e filologia, Raccolta di (dodici) studi sul ritmo e sulla metrica del Medio Evo, ed. by Giuseppe Vecchi, (Bologna: Forni, 1970).

5. Bibliography about Ugo Sesini

Pasquale Ferrarini and Ugo Saragiotto, *Ugo Sesini, Poesia e musica* (Milan: Stampa, 1995).

Rafaele Monterosso, *Musica e ritmica del trovatori* (Milano: Giuffrè, 1956).

Luigi Ronga, 'Ricordo di Ugo Sesini', *Cultura neolatina*, 8 (1948), 95-97.

Giuseppe Vecchi, 'Prefazione e Nota bio-bibliografica', in *Poesia e musica di U. Sesini* (Torino: S.E.I., 1949).

Joseph Pothier, *Les mélodies grégoriennes*, introd. by Jacques Chailley (Paris: Stock, 1980).

Raymond Klibansky (1905)

Martin THURNER

(Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)

"I believe that Dr. Klibansky, even if he's still quite young, is one of the four or five greatest academics in the world of medieval philosophy". That is what no less a person than Étienne Gilson (1884-1978) said about his 27-year-old colleague Raymond Klibansky back in 1933¹. Astonishingly, not only is Gilson's statement confirmed by Klibansky's personal development, but it should also be extended to a number of fields beyond the immediate context of medievalism. Klibansky's versatility regarding his scientific work and his eventful biography is unique among the great medievalists of the 20th century. Klibansky always connects his individual medievalist interests with actively taking part in the cultural life of his time and he continuously reacts to and reflects on the historical and political development of the 20th century. The following text briefly describes the most important stages of his life and work during which he has always kept his finger on the pulse of the century².

Raymond Klibansky was born on 15 October 1905 in Paris. He was the son of a German vintner family of Jewish descent. Klibansky's ability to easily blend into various cultures was already put to the test in his early teens. At the outbreak of World War One in 1914, his family had to flee from Paris to Frankfurt. He went to school at the 'Odenwaldschule' near Heidelberg. The school was famous for its positive attitude towards pedagogical reform. At the Odenwaldschule Klibansky went to the same class as Klaus Mann (1906-1949), the first son of Thomas Mann. In 1921 Klibansky began his studies of philosophy and philology at the University of Heidelberg. Back then the world of philosophy was dominated by the debate on the right stand on Kantian tradition between the Neokantian Heinrich Rickert (1863-1936) and the existentialist philosopher Karl Jaspers (1883-1969). Klibansky took part in Jaspers' seminars, where, among others, he met Golo Mann (1909-1994). What Klibansky particularly liked about Jaspers was his sophisticated way of leading philosophical dialogues. However, Jaspers' publications on the history of philosophy that focus on medieval writers, were not meant to earn Klibansky's unanimous assent. Being a critical historian Klibansky regarded Jaspers' book on Nicolaus Cusanus that was published in 1962, as nothing but "monumental cotton" as he said literally in a conversation with Kurt Flasch³.

¹ The statement was found in a letter of recommendation to the *Academic Assistance Council*, whose documents are today kept at the *Bibliotheca Bodleiana* in Oxford; quoted from: Raymond Klibansky, *Erinnerung an ein Jahrhundert. Gespräche mit Georges Leroux. Aus dem Französischen von Petra Willim* (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 2001), p. 100.

² As regards biographical information I refer to: Raymond Klibansky, *Erinnerung an ein Jahrhundert*, loc. cit. In addition I refer to personal information from Mrs Professor Ethel Groffier-Klibansky (Montréal), for which I want to express my deepest gratitude.

³ Quoted from: Kurt Flasch, 'Laudatio auf den Preisträger Raymond Klibansky', in *Verleihung des Lessingpreises 1993 an Raymond Klibansky. Reden anlässlich der Preisübergabe* (Hamburg: Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, 1994), pp. 12-22, here: p. 14.

Klibansky's particular interest in medievalism already became apparent in the early stages of his studies. The same is true of the specific interest of his research on the Middle Ages. In 1928 his doctoral study ended with the completion of his doctoral thesis on the School of Chartres. However, the political situation became increasingly worse for Jewish academics and prevented him from publishing his dissertation. Later on Klibansky wrote two essays in which he explained why he considered the School of Chartres to be of major importance⁴. One of the most significant members of this school, Bernhard of Chartres († ca 1130), once said that academics were dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants. For him the giants were the important figures of ancient philosophy. Compared to them, the modern philosophers appeared like dwarfs. The deeper implication of Bernhard's comparison was of course that the dwarfs could see as far as or even farther than the giants when they were standing on their shoulders. Bernhard sought to express that the thinking of his time could make progress if it built up on the achievements of ancient philosophy. Klibansky derived a major theme of his medievalist research from the way the medieval philosophers saw themselves. It was the question whether ancient philosophy persisted in the Middle Ages. With his dissertation Klibansky had already laid the foundations for his research.

Klibansky extended the question whether ancient thinking persisted and whether it was sensible to strictly separate historical eras. In his search for an answer to this he concentrated on the scholars of the Renaissance and of the modern age already in the early stages of his work. Significantly his first publication appeared in a book that described the philosophical premises of Klibansky's interests in this matter. In 1927 Klibansky published Carolus Bovillus' († 1553) *Liber de sapiente*. It was located in the appendix of Ernst Cassirer's (1874-1945) book *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy*. It was not just that Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms strongly influenced Klibansky's research. His personal relation to Cassirer itself also had a decisive effect on Klibansky's future life⁵. In 1926 Cassirer invited Klibansky to visit him at his house in Hamburg. He introduced him to Aby Warburg (1866-1929), who allowed Klibansky to use his famous library. It was just there where he met the art historian Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968) and the codicologist Fritz Saxl (1890-1948). As a result of this encounter Klibansky's probably most famous book came into being, the study *Saturn and Melancholy* with the subtitle *Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion and Art*.

In this book that was not published until 1964, which was more than 30 years after it was actually written, the interests of Aby Warburg and the philosophical method of Ernst Cassirer lead to a fruitful synthesis. Warburg took great interest in those powers of the mind that, apart from rationality, determine the human being, such as magic and astrology. With his idea of the symbolic forms Cassirer connect-

⁴ Compare Raymond Klibansky, 'Standing on the Shoulders of Giants', *Isis*, 26 (1936), pp. 147-149; and: Raymond Klibansky, 'The School of Chartres', in *Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society*, ed. by M. Clagett, G. Post, R. Reynolds (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), pp. 3-14.

⁵ Compare Raymond Klibansky, 'Erinnerungen an Ernst Cassirer. Raymond Klibansky im Gespräch mit Thomas Göller', *Internationale Zeitschrift für Philosophie* [no n^o.] issue 2 (1999), 275-288. Raymond Klibansky, 'Die Grenzen des akademischen Lebens sprengen. Ein Gespräch über Ernst Cassirer und die Bibliothek Warburg', *Merkur. Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäisches Denken*, 50 (1996), 274-277.

ed the various fields of cultural history like philosophy, science, myth, religion and art with one another. Besides that choosing melancholy as a field of research can be attributed to certain ideas of individual geniuses from the late Romantic period. These ideas had lived on, especially among the people around the German poet Stefan George (1868-1933).

During the time of his studies in Heidelberg, Klibansky also was amongst George's circle of acquaintances⁶. While the art historian Panofsky was working on a monograph about Albrecht Dürer's copperplate engraving *Melancholia I*, Klibansky pointed out to him the great variety of interpretations of the idea of melancholy in the history of philosophy. Later on he picked up that argument in a long chapter of a book with the same title. Here the starting point was the ancient idea of the "quatuor humores", the four body fluids that corresponded to the cosmic elements and periods. They determined the type of character of each individual human being depending on how they were combined. The book also contains a large section on how the ancient idea of melancholy was seen in the Middle Ages and how it developed further back then. Klibansky describes that the theory of the four temperaments became widely known especially due to Arabian medicine and the work of medieval scholars such as Constantius Africanus (ca 1015 – ca 1087) and Albertus Magnus (1193-1280).

In addition Klibansky brings out how the attitude towards melancholy changed in the Middle Ages. In the ancient world there was a clear difference between natural positive melancholy on the one hand and pathological melancholy on the other hand. As described in Plato's *Phaidros* this was due to the differentiation between divine delusion and delusion as a mental illness. Some medieval writers, however, claim that melancholy is nothing but a negative state of mind. Hildegard von Bingen (1098-1179), for example, says that melancholy means punishment for the Fall. However, in the Middle Ages there also existed new theoretical approaches on the understanding of melancholy. As an example Klibansky refers to the theory about a melancholy of love, an *amor heroicus*, which was expounded by the Catalan scholar Arnold of Villanova (ca 1235-1311/13). It had been inspired by Latin translations of Avicenna. New stimuli concerning the idea of melancholy in the Middle Ages also came from the influence of Arabian astrological literature. In the field of astrology melancholy was connected with Saturn. According to Neoplatonic tradition and for example Dante's *Paradiso*, Saturn is the planet of devout contemplation. The result of this connection was the idea of a unity between melancholy and ingeniousness. Renaissance philosopher Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499) was one of the first to embody a pinnacle of this idea. The reason why the ideas of melancholy in the Middle Ages are of fundamental importance to Klibansky's work is that they are prime examples for how variable the understanding of melancholy truly is.

The question whether there is persistence in the development of ideas in European philosophy became a dominant issue for further large-scale medievalist research projects that Klibansky started in Heidelberg near the end of the 1920s. Here Klibansky's main goal was to understand the characteristic way the Germans think that became manifest in Hegel's dialectic. According to Klibansky, German

⁶ Compare Raymond Klibansky, 'Aus dem Heidelberger Geistesleben. Autobiographische Anmerkungen', *Heidelberg. Geschichte und Gestalt*, Winter, (1996), 270-282.

philosophy is dominated by a characteristic tendency towards rationality and pushing forward to areas of the mind that go beyond rationality. Klibansky tried to understand this particular characteristic better by considering the historical context of a specific German tradition of thinking, which he put down to Nicolaus Cusanus (1401-1464) and Meister Eckhart (ca 1260-ca 1328).

Klibansky's interest in Cusanus is connected with the general rediscovery of this particular philosopher as of the late 19th century. Apart from the scholars of the Catholic Tübinger School around Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838) it were primarily the Neokantians, who showed interest in Cusanus again. They were looking for answers to questions on epistemology and the philosophy of the mind. What the philosopher Hermann Cohen (1842-1918) from Marburg particularly liked about Cusanus was how he developed his philosophy. Cusanus took mathematical as well as scientific models as a basis. In his work Ernst Cassirer, who was a pupil of Cohen at Marburg, further concentrated on these aspects. In his book *The Problem of Knowledge in Modern Philosophy and Science* that he published in 1906, Cassirer focuses on Cusanus in the entire first chapter. Cohen had already concentrated on publishing new editions of Cusanus' works. These books were brought out by the publishing house Meiner as a part of its 'Philosophische Bibliothek' (particular line of books).

After Cohens death, the idea of a new edition on Cusanus' collected works was taken up by Ernst Hoffmann (1880-1952), one of Cassirer's pupils and Professor of Philosophy at Heidelberg. Hoffmann is known to carry out studies on the history of Platonism in the Middle Ages and he was Klibansky's supervisor while he finished his doctoral thesis about the School of Chartres in 1928. Klibansky took part in one of Hoffmann's seminars about Cusanus in 1927⁷. It was the same year that Cassirer's book *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy* was published. It contained an excerpt of Cusanus' *Idiota de mente*. Klibansky pointed out to Cassirer that this particular excerpt was based on an uncritical volume of the 16th century. It was the Parisian Cusanus edition by Faber Stapulensis (1455-1537) of 1514, which was newly reprinted by Henricus Petri (1441-1511) at Basel in 1565. In his discussion with Cassirer, Klibansky emphasised that it was highly necessary to publish a historically critical Cusanus edition and that such an edition should be based on all preserved manuscripts available. For this purpose Klibansky analysed each handwritten document inside and outside of the Cusanus library at St. Nikolaus Hospital in Kues that he could find. During a visit to Hamburg, he presented to Cassirer his conception of a critical Cusanus edition. They sent this conception to Hans von Schubert (1859-1931), who was Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Heidelberg and president of the 'Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften' (Heidelberg Academy of Science). Schubert realised how important the project was and arranged for the academy's decision to publish the Cusanus edition. For this purpose a special commission called the (still existing) Cusanus Commission

⁷ In a personal letter (July 25, 2003) to the author Prof. Morimichi Watanabe (New York) wrote: "Another fact I wish to mention in this connection is that one of my teachers at Columbia University was Professor Paul Oskar Kristeller, who was a student of Ernst Hoffmann both at his *Gymnasium* in Berlin and later at Heidelberg University. Klibansky and Kristeller were Hoffmann's students at Heidelberg and became 'rivals' later as scholars in the good sense of the word. I believe that we can also call them 'giants', the kind, I am afraid, we are not going to see in the future. I was privileged to know them both and had them simultaneously as members of the Advisory Board of our Society until Prof. Kristeller died in 1999".

was installed. In the beginning, the commission's members were Klibansky, Ernst Hoffmann and the Neokantian Heinrich Rickert (1863-1936). Since 1928 Klibansky had been employed by the academy as academic specialist for the Cusanus edition⁸.

Not only did Klibansky significantly influence the planning of the Cusanus edition, but he also supervised the actual structuring of the individual volumes. Klibansky found it especially important to include a source directory and extra information on the consequences of Cusanus' work apart from the main discussion. In this way Klibansky could refute Ernst Hoffmann's opinion that there was no connection between medieval Platonism and Cusanus. He proved that there existed a direct continuity and reception between the Platonism taught at the School of Chartres and Cusanus.

Before the first volume of the critical Cusanus edition came out, Klibansky and Hoffmann released two of Cusanus' texts as separate publications. These texts were meant to help in understanding Cusanus' main work. In 1929 the sermon *Dies sanctificatus* of Christmas 1439 was published in the *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie*. Its comparison to the *Docta ignorantia*, which was finished in 1440, is quite revealing. Apart from that, Klibansky published a text on Cusanus' view of the universe that was attached to a study by Hoffmann in 1930. The study was on the same topic. Only two years later, the first and second volume of the Cusanus edition could be presented. The first one was the *Apologia doctae ignorantiae*, which was published by Klibansky alone. The second one was the *Docta ignorantia*, which Klibansky and Hoffmann published together. The initial plan was to limit the edition to Cusanus' philosophical essays and his texts concerning state policy. The entire edition was to comprise 14 volumes altogether and was scheduled to be completed in 1939. The first two volumes were enthusiastically welcomed by famous medievalists and no less a person than Martin Grabmann (1875-1949) expressly emphasised Klibansky's work in a review⁹. Other critical editions about medieval scholars, such as Albertus Magnus and Johannes Duns Scots, were explicitly planned and structured following the example set by Klibansky's Heidelberg Cusanus edition.

The fact that Klibansky started a second collected works project, aside from the Cusanus edition, shows Klibansky's enormous working power and initiative during

⁸ Regarding the history of the Cusanus edition at the academy of Heidelberg compare primarily: various writers, (no title), Reports on the progress of the Cusanus edition at the Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. In: *Sitzungsgeschichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Jahreshefte*. Heidelberg, Winter, (1927-28), p. VII, VIII, X, XIII-XVIII. 1928-29: p. VI, XI, XVI-XVII. 1929-30: p. IV, VII, XI, XIII, XVIII, XXI-XXIV. 1930-31: p. X, XV-XVI. 1931-32: p. XVII, XIV-XVI. 1932-33: p. VI, VIII, XV. 1933-34: p. III, X-XI. 1935-36: p. V-VI, XVI. As well as: Morimichi Watanabe, 'The Origins of modern Cusanus Research in Germany and the Establishment of the Heidelberg *Opera omnia*', in Gerald Christianson and Thomas M. Izbicki, *Nicholas of Cusa in Search of God and Wisdom* (Leiden et al.: Brill, 1991), pp. 17-42. In addition: Thea Hoffmann, 'Wie die Cusanus-Ausgabe begann', *Mitteilungen und Forschungsbeiträge der Cusanus-Gesellschaft*, 5 (1965), 164-165. Werner Beierwaltes, (no title). In *Ceterum censeo... Bemerkungen zu Aufgabe und Tätigkeit eines philosophischen Verlegers*. Richard Meiner zum 8. April 1983. (Hamburg: Meiner, 1983), pp. 26-30. Karl Bormann, (no title). *Ibid.*, 31-34. Hans Gerhard Senger, 'Die kritische Edition der Werke des Nikolaus von Kues', *Akademie-Journal. Mitteilungsblatt der Konferenz der deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften* 2/95 (1996), pp. 5-10. Senger, 'Die Nikolaus-von-Kues-Ausgabe als Beispiel einer historisch-kritischen Edition', *Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung*, 38/1 (1984), pp. 73-83.

⁹ Martin Grabmann, review of: *Nicolai de Cusa Opera omnia*, in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung, Dritte Folge*, 4. Jahrgang, Heft 15 (9. April 1933), Sp. 685-692.

his time in Heidelberg. In 1932 Klibansky worked out a plan for a critical edition on the Latin writings by Meister Eckhart comprising 17 fascicles. In this project Klibansky intended to work together with the Historical Institute of the Dominicans *Santa Sabina* in Rome. At that time the head of the institute was the well-known Eckhart specialist Gabriel Théry (1891-1959) from France. Klibansky's interest in Eckhart had the same reason as his interest in Cusanus. Klibansky believed that Meister Eckhart's image of the spark of the soul, which is a direct part of God, anticipated the Hegelian idea of dialectically going beyond rationality concept of freedom resulting from it. But it was already during its creation process that the Eckhart project turned out to be much more complicated than the Cusanus edition.

As the political climate of the 1930s deteriorated in Germany, Meister Eckhart's theories were taken up for the sake of ideology. In his book *The Myth of the 20th Century* the National Socialist ideologist Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946) devoted an extensive chapter to Meister Eckhart. There he built up Eckhart and claimed that he was the reincarnation of Odin, the centre of Aryan philosophy. With his northern thinking Eckhart had been the major figure in Germanic philosophy. That was the moment Klibansky realised what happened. Eckhart's legacy was only vulnerable to distortion because Eckhart's sermons and tracts in German were the only original source and could only be found in unreliable volumes. Eckhart's Latin works, however, were largely unknown. Klibansky pointed out that Meister Eckhart's traditional German texts could only be understood properly if the reader knows the speculative Latin works. However, it was only possible to comprehend these Latin manuscripts, if they are seen in the context of their creation at the Universities of Paris and Cologne. Using the Latin works Klibansky demonstrated that it were Arabian and Jewish scholars, such as Maimonides (1135-1204), who inspired Eckhart. But this did certainly not fit into the picture of their "German Master" that the National Socialists projected. As a consequence it did not take long until Klibansky had to face vehement opposition. His critics complained that the project was solely carried out by Jewish and foreign academics.

Shortly after Klibansky published the first fascicle, the Latin sermon on the Lord's Prayer, at the publishing house Meiner in Leipzig in 1934, he had to face competition. The 'Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft' (German Research Society) started to work on a competing edition with the publishing house Kohlhammer (Stuttgart) in 1936. Aside from the Latin manuscripts, this version was planned to contain the texts in German. The head of the project was the Protestant ecclesiastical historian Erich Seeberg (1888-1945). While Josef Koch (1885-1967) became responsible for the Latin texts, Josef Quint (1898-1976) was in charge of the German part. Seeberg had virtually adapted the National Socialist projection of Eckhart and started inveighing against Klibansky's edition in an impertinent way¹⁰. He achieved that all Eckhart manuscripts located in German libraries were no longer available to the competing editors. Klibansky neither wanted nor could continue his work

¹⁰ Erich Seeberg, 'Eckhartiana I', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 56 (1937), 87-105. Id., 'Die verlorene Handschrift', *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, 8 (1937), 386-397. In addition: Ingeborg Degenhardt, 'Studien zum Wandel des Eckhartbildes' (=Studien zur Problemgeschichte der antiken und mittelalterlichen Philosophie 3). (Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 294-297. Karl Albert, (no title). In: *Ceterum censeo... Bemerkungen zu Aufgabe und Tätigkeit eines philosophischen Verlegers*. Richard Meiner zum 8. April 1983 (Hamburg, Meiner: 1983), pp. 23-25.

under such circumstances. He therefore resigned from his post as chief of the edition at the Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Aside from the sermon on the Lord's Prayer only two further fascicles had been published. The first was the prologues of the *Opus tripartitum*. It was edited by the Benedictine Hildebrand Bascour (1900-1990)¹¹ from Belgium and published in 1935. The second was *Parisian Questions and Prologues* edited by the French Dominican Antoine Dondaine (1898-1987) and published in 1936. It contained commentary by Klibansky in Latin. The difficulties that Klibansky's edition had to face became more fierce as Josef Koch identified a number of mistakes in it and listed them in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* in 1936¹². The Eckhart edition from Stuttgart also contained the sermon on the Lord's Prayer and the *Parisian Questions and Prologues*. This was clearly shows that there was a strong competition between the two editions.

Klibansky carried out the Eckhart edition project under the worst possible personal circumstances. In 1933 the pressure exercised by the National Socialist rule made Klibansky emigrate via the Netherlands to London where he became Honorary Lecturer at King's College. In addition, the library of Warburg employed him. He had arranged the library's move from Hamburg to London as early as the beginning of the National Socialist rule. During the confusions of World War Two Klibansky continued his research work, but he also worked for the British Intelligence. Most likely it was his influence that prevented the Allies from bombarding St. Nikolaus Hospital in Kues with its precious collections of Cusanus' handwritten manuscripts.

In spite of the unfavourable times Klibansky took the initiative and started another innovative edition, namely the *Corpus Platonicum Medii Aevi*. In his research on German dialectical thinking he went from Hegel back to Cusanus and Eckhart. As a result of his research on these philosophers Klibansky discovered that, in fact, Platonism had strongly influenced their philosophy. In connection with this Klibansky made an amazing find in the library of Cusanus as early as 1927. In the Latin translation owned by Cusanus of Proklos' commentary on Plato's *Parmenides*, Klibansky found a text that was missing in the widely spread Greek edition¹³. That was why he actually recognised the true meaning of the medieval translations for the history of both Platonism and dialectical thinking. However, these translations had not yet been presented in a coherent critical edition. After intense research work that Klibansky expounds in his book *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages*, released in London in 1939, he started to plan such an edition. Soon Klibansky realised that he ought to include the Arabian propagators of Platonic thinking from the Middle Ages in an individual section called *Plato Arabus*. The first two fascicles of the corpus, which was released at the Warburg Institute in London, contained those two dialogues by Plato that had been fully translated in the 12th century already. It was the *Menon*, released in 1940, and the *Phaidon*, released in 1950.

¹¹ Regarding Bascour's cooperation with Klibansky also compare: Roland Hissette, 'In memoriam H. Bascour', *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* (Edité par la SIEPM), 32 (1990), p. 241.

¹² Josef Koch, 'Kritische Bemerkungen zu Hildebrand Bascours neuer Ausgabe der Eckhart-Prologe', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 55 (1936), pp. 264-285.

¹³ Raymond Klibansky, 'Ein Proklos-Fund und seine Bedeutung' (=Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 1928/29, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 5. Abhandlung) Heidelberg, Winter, 1929.

Publishing Plato's vital text for the Middle Ages, the *Timaios*, and the commentaries on it was a primary issue. Although this dialogue by Plato in the version of Chalcidius from the 4th century was not fully translated, it had great influence on the development of a rational cosmology in the Middle Ages. This influence contributed to the development of modern natural science.

Klibansky's research on Apuleius (2nd century) is also connected with the question whether the Platonic tradition persists. In 1993 he published a complete directory of the entire handwritten philosophical work of Apuleius together with Frank Regen. Referring to marginal notes that he found in the Apuleius documents he concluded how Platonic ideas were put across to Petrarca (1304-1374), Cusanus and Ficino. With his research on Platonic tradition in Latin-Arabian medieval times Klibansky tried to explain how Plato's ideas had stayed alive in the history of European thinking, although his dialogues had not been available in the Greek original. Since Klibansky's research work, the rather confusing structure of epochs, namely the Aristotle Middle Ages on the one hand and the Platonic Renaissance on the other hand, has finally become obsolete.

What is most intriguing about Klibansky's biography is the fact that not only did he witness the pinnacle of German-Jewish academic culture and its bloody suppression by the National Socialists, but he also took part in rebuilding the world in the post-war period. In 1946 Klibansky followed a call to the English-speaking McGill University in Montréal. From 1947 he lectured for 21 years as Permanent Guest Professor at the local French-speaking university. He worked closely together with the medievalist Benoît Lacroix (*1915), the head of the local Albertus Magnus Institute for Medieval Studies¹⁴.

Aside from the medievalist research Klibansky's philosophical interests were dominated by his experiences of dictatorship and world wars. As a consequence he planned to publish a number of texts that would proclaim tolerance and dialogue on a philosophical basis. He thought about texts like John Locke's (1632-1704) *A Letter Concerning Tolerance* or Asoka's famous Indian Edicts from the 3rd century, which demanded freedom of worship for the first time ever. Klibansky's research on tolerance is also strongly connected with medievalist interests. Cusanus' dialogue *On Peaceful Unity of Faith* that was published by Klibansky and Hildebrand Bascour in 1956, already contains central aspects of the idea of tolerance. Klibansky succeeded in proving that, among others, even Lessing (1729-1781) knew this text. Thus he concluded that it influenced the ideas of tolerance during the Enlightenment¹⁵.

When he was president of the International Institute of Philosophy (1966-1969), Klibansky actively supported the worldwide dialogue between cultures and philosophies. In this position he published a number of companion volumes on the contemporary situation of philosophy worldwide. He also published a few multilingual

¹⁴ Raymond Klibansky, 'Rencontres avec Benoît Lacroix', in *Dits et gestes de Benoît Lacroix* (Montréal : Editions du Noroît / Fondation Albert-le-Grand, 1995), pp. 143-145.

¹⁵ Also Compare with Lessing: Raymond Klibansky, 'Rede zum Lessingpreis der Stadt Hamburg', in *'Verleihung des Lessingpreises 1993 an 'Raymond Klibansky. Reden anlässlich der Preisübergabe'* (Hamburg: Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, 1994), pp. 23-32.

dictionaries and encyclopaedias that were meant to make communication between philosophers from different countries easier¹⁶.

Looking back at Raymond Klibansky's life – now almost lasting a whole century – we can finally state: seldom if ever did someone transform the shocking events of our contemporary history into highly positive commitment in a dialectical way as Klibansky has been doing in his entire life.

Chronology

- 1905. Raymond Klibansky is born on 15 October in Paris as the son of a German vintner.
- 1914. At the beginning of World War One Klibansky's family emigrates from Paris to Frankfurt.
- 1921. Klibansky starts studying philosophy and philology in Heidelberg (with Karl Jaspers). Klibansky was a member of Stefan George's (Friedrich Gundolf) circle of acquaintances and frequented the house of Max Weber's widow.
- 1924. On Jaspers' recommendation Klibansky becomes assistant to the sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies in Kiel.
- 1926. Upon invitation by Ernst Cassirer Klibansky moves from Heidelberg to Hamburg where he stays at Cassirer's place. Together with Hans Saxl and Erwin Panofsky he works on *Saturn and Melancholy* at the Warburg library.
- 1927. Klibansky's first scientific publication is an attachment to Cassirer's book *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy*. It is an edition of Carolus Bovillus' *De sapiente*. In Kues Klibansky discovers the Latin translation of an ending of Proklos' commentary on *Parmenides* that had been unknown up to then. He presents a plan for a critical edition of the works of Nikolaus Cusanus to the Heidelberg Academy of Science and is given the task by Heinrich Rickert and Ernst Hoffmann. In 1932 *Apologia doctae ignorantiae* and *De docta ignorantia* is published.
- 1928. Klibansky earns his doctorate at the University of Heidelberg with Professor Ernst Hoffmann. He writes his doctoral thesis on the School of Chartres.
- 1928. Klibansky starts his work as scientific assistant at the Heidelberg Academy of Science. He begins his research for the Cusanus edition.
- 1931. Klibansky achieves habilitation at the University of Heidelberg with his thesis on *Philosophy and History*. He is appointed as 'Privatdozent' (title of a lecturer, who is not a professor and not a civil servant at a university).
- 1932. Klibansky is planning a critical edition of Meister Eckhart's Latin works (*Magistri Eckhardi Opera Latina*) at the Heidelberg Academy of Science (publishing house Meiner, Leipzig). *Super oratione dominica* (ed. Klibansky 1934) and *Parisian Questions and Prologues* (ed. Dondaine 1936) is published. Due to political reasons the edition can no longer be continued.
- 1933. Klibansky emigrates from Heidelberg via the Netherlands to London. During the Second World War he works for the British intelligence division *Political Warfare Executive*.
- 1934. Klibansky is appointed Honorary Lecturer at King's College, London. Beginning his editorial work on the *Corpus Platonicum Medii Aevi* in Oxford (*College Oriel*).
- 1936. Klibansky publishes a commemorative compilation for Cassirer. It is titled *Philosophy and History*.
- 1939. *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition* is published at Warburg Institute in London.

¹⁶ Regarding Klibansky's project on a multilingual dictionary of philosophical terms also compare: Richard McKeon, 'The meaning of Justice and the Relations among Traditions of Thought', in *Contribution au projet d'un Dictionnaire international des Termes fondamentaux de la Philosophie et de la Pensée politique réalisé sous les auspices du Conseil international de Philosophie et des Sciences humaines avec l'aide de l'UNESCO*. Released in: *Revue internationale de philosophie*, 11/41 (1957), pp. 253-267.

1941. The first volume of *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (co-production with Richard Hunt; eight volumes until 1968) is published.
1946. Klibansky is appointed as Professor at the English-speaking McGill University in Montréal.
1947. Klibansky starts to work as a Guest Lecturer at the Albertus Magnus Institute for Medieval Studies of the French-speaking University of Montréal.
1956. Editing Nikolaus Cusanus' *De pace fidei* (together with H. Bascour)
1957. Founding the line of books *Philosophie et communauté mondiale* with a number of multilingual editions containing original texts on the ideas of tolerance and world community, among others, John Locke's *A Letter Concerning Tolerance* (1964) and *The Edicts of Asoka* (1968).
1964. *Saturn and Melancholy* (English version) is published in London and New York almost thirty years after it was written.
1966. Until 1969 Klibansky is president of the *International Institute of Philosophy*. In this capacity he publishes a number of companion volumes and multilingual dictionaries to support the worldwide development of philosophy: *Philosophy in the Mid-Century* (1958-59); *Contemporary Philosophy* (1968-71); *La philosophie en Europe* (1993); *Glossaire des mot-clefs de la philosophie* (1996)
1993. Klibansky is granted the Lessing Prize in Hamburg
1995. Klibansky is granted the Honorary Doctorate at the University of Bologna as well as the Nonino Prize

Selected bibliography

1. Texts by Klibansky

a) Editions and books

- Carlous Bovillus, *Liber de Sapiente*, ed. by Raymond Klibansky, in Ernst Cassirer, *Individuum und Kosmos in der Philosophie der Renaissance* [=Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 10]. (Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner, 1927; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963 and 1994), pp. 299-458.
- Ein Proklos-Fund und seine Bedeutung* [=Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 1928/29, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 5. Abhandlung] (Heidelberg: Winter, 1929).
- Cusanus-Texte I. 1. Predigten. Dies Sanctificatus' vom Jahre 1439*, ed. by Ernst Hoffmann and Raymond Klibansky [=Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 1928/29. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 3. Abhandlung 1929] (Heidelberg: Winter, 1929).
- Nicolai de Cusa, *Opera omnia (iussu et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Heidelbergensis edita)*. Vol. II: *Apologia Doctae Ignorantiae*, (Lipsiae: Meiner, 1932).
- Nicolai de Cusa, *Opera omnia (iussu et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Heidelbergensis edita)*. Vol. I: *De Docta Ignorantia*, ed. with Ernst Hoffmann (Lipsiae: Meiner, 1932).
- Magistri Eckardi, *Opera Latina (auspiciis Instituti S. Sabinae in Urbe ad codicum fidem edita)*. Fasc. I: *Super oratione dominica* (Lipsiae: Meiner, 1934).
- Magistri Eckardi, *Opera Latina (auspiciis Instituti S. Sabinae in Urbe ad codicum fidem edita)*. Fasc. XIII: *Quaestiones Parisienses*. Edidit Antonius Dondaine OPP. *Commentariolum de Eckardi Magisterio*. Adiunxit Raymundus Klibansky (Lipsiae: Meiner, 1936).
- Philosophy and History. Essays in Honour of Ernst Cassirer* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1936), (with Herbert J. Paton); repr., with enlarged bibliography (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963)
- The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition* (London: The Warburg Institute, 1939; 2nd, London, 1950).

- Corpus Platicum Medii Aevi*. Auspiciis Academiae Britannicae edidit Raymundus Klibansky.
Published so far:
- Plato Latinus I: Meno, Interprete Henrico Aristippo*, Victor Kordeuter. Recognovit et praefatione instruxit Carlotta Labowsky (Londonii: In aedibus Instituti Warburgiani, 1940).
- Plato Latinus II: Phaedo, Interprete Henrico Aristippo*. ed. et praefatione instruxit L. Minio-Paluello (Londonii: In aedibus Instituti Warburgiani, 1950).
- Plato Latinus III: Platonis Parmenides nec non Procli Commentarium in Parmenidem, pars adhuc inedita*. Ediderunt, praefatione adnotationibusque illustraverunt Raymundus Klibansky et Carlotta Labowsky (Londonii: In aedibus Instituti Warburgiani, 1953).
- Plato Latinus IV: Timaeus, a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*. ed. by Jan H. Waszink (Londonii et Leida: In aedibus Instituti Warburgiani, 1962).
- Plato Arabus I: Galeni Compendium Timaei Platonis*, ed. by Paulus Kraus et Richardus Walzer (Londonii: In aedibus Instituti Warburgiani, 1961).
- Plato Arabus II: Alfarabius de Platonis Philosophia*, ed. by Franciscus Rosenthal and Richardus Walzer (Londonii: In aedibus Instituti Warburgiani, 1943).
- Plato Arabus III: Alfarabius Compendium legum Platonis*, ed. by Jan H. Waszink (Londonii: In aedibus Instituti Warburgiani, 1952).
- Reprint of *Plato Latinus I-III* and *Plato Arabus I-III* (Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1973). Second edition of *Plato Latinus IV* (Leiden: Brill, 1975).
- Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* (ed. with Richard W. Hunt, Oxford, 1941-1956, 6 vols and 3 Supl.).
- Leibniz's Unknown Correspondence with English Scholars and Men of Letters*. in *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* I/1 (London: The Warburg Institute, 1941), pp. 133-147 and separately.
- Mussolini, Benito, *Memoirs 1942-1943, with documents Relating to the Period*, transl. by Frances Lobb, ed. by Raymond Klibansky (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1949); repr. (New York: Fertig, 1975).
- Croce, Benedetto, *My philosophy, and other essays on the moral and political problems of our time*, ed. by Raymond Klibansky (London: Allen & Unwin, 1949); (New York: MacMillan, 1949). Repr. (New York: Collier Books, 1962).
- New Letters of David Hume* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), (ed. with Ernst C. Mossner); repr. (Oxford: 1969; New York: Garland, 1983).
- Nelson Philosophical Texts*, General Editor (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1951-1962, 8 vols).
- Nicolai de Cusa, *De pace fidei*. Ediderunt commentariisque illustraverunt Raymundus Klibansky et Hildebrandus Bascour OSB. (London: University of London, The Warburg Institute, 1956; repr. Nendeln (Liechtenstein): Kraus, 1977).
- Plato, *Philebus and Epinomis*, trans. by Alfred E. Taylor, ed. by Raymond Klibansky (with the cooperation of Guido Calogero) (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1956; Repr. Folkestone and London: Dawson, 1971).
- Locke, John, *Ein Brief über Toleranz* (Englisch-Deutsch), ed. by Julius Ebbinghaus. Mit einer Einführung zur Reihe, 'La philosophie et la communauté mondiale' von Raymond Klibansky (Hamburg: Meiner, 1957).
- Philosophy in the Mid-Century - La Philosophie au Milieu du Vingtième Siècle*, Introd. by Raymond Klibansky (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1958-59, 4 vols.).
- Plato, *Sophist and Statesman*, transl. by Alfred E. Taylor, ed. by Raymond Klibansky and Gertrude Elizabeth Margaret Anscombe (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1961; repr. Folkestone and London: Dawson of Pall Mall, 1971).
- Locke, John, *Lettera sulla Tolleranza. Testo latino e versione italiana*. Premessa (pp. V-X) ed edizione del testo latino di Raymond Klibansky. [=Filosofia e Comunità Mondiale 3] (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1961). Premessa (Introduction) reprinted in Pensatori Antichi e Moderni. Vol. 62 (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1963).
- Locke, John, *Carta sobre la tolerancia*, preface Raymond Klibansky. [=Filosofia y Comunidad Mundial. Serie dirigida por Raymond Klibansky], (Montréal: Casalini, 1962).

- Locke, John, *List o tolerancji* (Latin and Polish), ed. by Raymond Klibansky (Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1963).
- Saturn and Melancholy. Studies in the History of Religion, Art, and Natural Philosophy*, ed. with Erwin Panofsky and Fritz Saxl (London: Nelson, 1964; New York: Basic Books, 1964). Reprint (Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1979).
- Locke, John, *Lettre sur la Tolérance. Texte latin et traduction française*, ed. by Raymond Klibansky, I: (Montréal: Casalini, 1964) ; II (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965). 2nd ed.: Paris 1967.
- Introduction*, in *Spinoza on Freedom of Thought* (Japanese) [=Philosophy and World Community] (Tokyo: Risosha, 1966).
- Introduction*, in *The Edicts of Asoka* (Hebrew). The Hebrew University (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1968).
- Locke, John, *Epistola de Tolerantia – A Letter on Toleration*, ed. by Raymond Klibansky. English translation with an introduction and notes by John W. Gough (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).
- Locke, John, *Epistola de Tolerantia* (Latin and Japanese), ed. by Raymond Klibansky. Japanese transl. by A. Hirano (Tokyo: Asahi, 1970).
- Contemporary Philosophy– La Philosophie Contemporaine*. ed. by Raymond Klibansky (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1968-71, 4 vols).
- Locke, John, *Levél a vallási türelemről*, (Latin and Hungarian), ed. by Raymond Klibansky. Hungarian translation of introduction and text by László Mátrai (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973; 2nd ed.: 1982).
- Nicolai de Cusa: *De docta ignorantia, Liber tertius*. Ed. Raymundus Klibansky. Nikolaus von Kues: *Die belehrte Unwissenheit, Buch III*, transl. by Hans G. Senger, with an appendix (pp. 205-236), *Zur Geschichte der Überlieferung der Docta ignorantia* von Raymond Klibansky. [=Philosophische Bibliothek Meiner 264c. Nikolaus von Kues. Schriften in deutscher Übersetzung, Heft 15c] (Hamburg: Meiner, 1977).
- The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages*. With a new preface and four supplementary chapters. Together with *Plato's Parmenides in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. With a new introductory preface (München: Kraus, 1981 and Milwood; N.Y. / London / Nendeln-Liechtenstein: 1982).
- Nicolai de Cusa: *Opera Omnia (iussu et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Heidelbergensis ad codicum fidem edita)*. Vol. XII: *De venatione sapientiae. De apice theoriae*. Ed. commentariisque illustraverunt Raymundus Klibansky et Iohannes Gerhardus Senger (Hamburg: Meiner, 1982).
- Nicolai de Cusa: *Opera Omnia (iussu et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Heidelbergensis ad codicum fidem edita)*. Vol. V: *Idiota de sapientia. Idiota de mente*. Ed. alteram cur. R. Steiger. Duas appendices adiecit Raymundus Klibansky: I: *De memoria librorum Idiotae*. II: *De dialogis De vera sapientia Francisco Petrarcae addictis* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1983), pp. LI-LXXII. First edition (Lipsiae: Meiner, 1937).
- Locke, John: *Epistola de Tolerantia and a Second Letter concerning Toleration*. (Hebräisch). Translation by Joram Bronowsky. Pref. by Raymond Klibansky. Ed. by Jacob Golomb. The Hebrew University (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1990).
- Contemporary Philosophy. A new Survey*, ed. by Guttorm Fløistad and Raymond Klibansky. Vol. VI: *Philosophy and Science in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols (Dordrecht / Boston / London: Kluwer, 1990).
- Introduction*, in *Philosophy in Europe*. A collection of Surveys. ed. by Raymond Klibansky and David Pears (Paris: Gallimard, 1993).
- Die Handschriften der Philosophischen Werke des Apuleius*. With Frank Regen. [=Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3] (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).
- La philosophie en Europe*, ed. by Raymond Klibansky et David Pears (Paris: Gallimard, 1993).
- Bibliographie de la philosophie. Glossaire–Bibliography of Philosophy. Glossary* [English, German, Spanish, Italian] (Paris: J. Vrin, 1996).

- Le Philosophe et la mémoire du siècle* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998; Montréal: Boréal, 2000). Spanish translation (Barcelona, 1999). German translation: *Erinnerung an ein Jahrhundert. Gespräche mit Georges Leroux*.
- La pensée philosophique d'expression française au Canada. Le rayonnement du Québec*, ed. by Raymond Klibansky and Josiane Boulad-Ayoub, introd. by Raymond Klibansky (Québec: Les presses de l'Université Laval, 1998).

b) Essays and notes

- 'The Philosophical Character of History', in *Philosophy and History. Essays in Honour of Ernst Cassirer*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1936), pp. 233-337 (ed. with Herbert J. Paton); repr., with enlarged bibliography (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963).
- 'Letters of Hume', in *Times Literary Supplement*, 38/1929 (21 January 1939), p. 41.
- 'Plato's Parmenides in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance', in *University of London, The Warburg Institute* (1943).
- 'L'Épître de Bérenger de Poitiers contre les Chartreux', in *Revue du Moyen Âge Latin*, 2 (1946), 314-316.
- 'An International Dictionary of the Basic Terms of Philosophy and Political Thought', in *Proceedings of the Third Interamerican Congress of Philosophy*, Mexico 1950. Published in Spanish: *Un Diccionario Internacional de los Términos Fundamentales de Filosofía y del Pensamiento Político* (México: 1950).
- 'The Rock of Parmenides. Mediaeval Accounts of the Origins of Dialectic', *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, 1/2 (1943), 171-186.
- 'Copernic et Nicolas de Cues', in *Léonard de Vinci et l'esprit scientifique au XVI^e siècle. Études publiées par le Centre National de la recherche scientifique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1953), pp. 225-235.
- 'The School of Chartres', in *Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society*, ed. by Marshall Clagett Gaines Post and Robert Reynolds (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1961), pp. 3-14. Paperback edition: 1966.
- 'Peter Abailard and Bernard of Clairvaux. A letter by Abailard', *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, 5 (1961), 1-27 and separately.
- 'Neoplatonism and Christianity', *Archivio di Filosofia*, 52 (1984), 591-594.
- 'Die Wirkungsgeschichte des Dialogs "De pace fidei"', in *Der Friede unter den Religionen nach Nikolaus von Kues. Akten des Symposions in Trier vom 13. bis 15. Oktober 1982*, ed. by Rudolf Haubst [=Mitteilungen und Forschungsbeiträge der Cusanus-Gesellschaft 16] (Mainz: Grünewald, 1984), pp. 113-25, 268.
- 'Cultures and Values in Historical Perspective', in *Philosophy and Culture. Proceedings of the XVIIth World Congress of Philosophy*, ed. by Venant Cauchy (Montréal: Editions du Beffroi / Editions Montmorency, 1986-1988), pp. 89-92.
- Furthermore about 100 philosophical and historical *Book Reviews* in different papers and reviews.

2. Autobiographical information

- 'Raymond Klibansky, philosophe et historien. Entretien avec Yves Hersant et Alain de Libera [=Archéobibliographie Raymond Klibansky, second article]', *Préfaces. Les idées et les sciences dans la bibliographie de la France*, 13 (Mai - juin 1989), 132-142.
- 'L'Université allemande dans les années trente (notes autobiographiques)', *Philosophiques*, 18 (1991), 139-157.
- 'Conversazione con Raymond Klibansky a cura di Francesco Barocelli', in *Filosofia, scienza e astrologia nel Trecento europeo. A cura di Graziella Federici Vescovini* (Padova: Il Poligrafo, 1992), pp. 7-18.

- 'Rede zum Lessingpreis der Stadt Hamburg', in *Verleihung des Lessingpreises 1993 an Raymond Klibansky. Reden anlässlich der Preisübergabe* (Hamburg: Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, 1994), pp. 23-32.
- 'Rencontres avec Benoît Lacroix', in *Dits et gestes de Benoît Lacroix*, (Montréal: Editions du Noroît/ Fondation Albert-le-Grand, 1995), pp. 143-145.
- 'Die Grenzen des akademischen Lebens sprengen. Ein Gespräch über Ernst Cassirer und die Bibliothek Warburg', in *Merkur. Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäisches Denken*, 50 (1996), pp. 274-277.
- 'Aus dem Heidelberger Geistesleben. Autobiographische Anmerkungen', in *Heidelberg. Geschichte und Gestalt* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1996), pp. 270-282.
- Le Philosophe et la mémoire du siècle. Tolérance, liberté et philosophie. Entretiens avec Georges Leroux* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1998). Montréal, Boréal, 2000. Spanish translation (Barcelona: 1999). German translation: *Erinnerung an ein Jahrhundert. Gespräche mit Georges Leroux*. Aus dem Französischen von Petra Willim (Frankfurt: Insel, 2001).
- 'Erinnerungen an Ernst Cassirer. Raymond Klibansky im Gespräch mit Thomas Göller', in *Internationale Zeitschrift für Philosophie* [no no.] 1999, Heft 2, pp. 275-288.
- Erlebte Geschichte erzählt 1994-1997. Michael Buselmeier im Gespräch mit Raymond Klibansky [und anderen]*, ed. by der Stadt Heidelberg (Heidelberg: 2000), pp. 8-29.
- Verzweifeln an der Welt. Und Raymond Klibansky kannte sie alle. Ein Plädoyer für die Melancholie*. [=Interview mit Raymond Klibansky von André Behr und Lars Reichardt], in *Süddeutsche Zeitung Magazin, Beilage zu: Süddeutsche Zeitung* Nr. 114 vom 18. Mai 2001, pp. 18-23. Reprint in Behr, André und Reichardt, Lars: *Lauter bitte!* (Düsseldorf: My favourite book, 2001).

3. Commemorative publications for Klibansky

- Méthode et Philosophie de l'histoire. Hommage à Raymond Klibansky*, Numéro thématique de la *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 29/111-112 (1975).
- Reason, Action and Experience*, éd. par Helmut Kohlenberger (Hamburg: Meiner, 1979).
- Hommage à Raymond Klibansky* (Montréal: Université du Québec à Montréal, 1991).
- Georges Leroux, *Hommage à Raymond Klibansky: De Nicolas de Cues aux enfants de Saturne. – Bibliographie des travaux de Raymond Klibansky. – Curriculum vitae* (Paris: Gallimard, 1991).
- The Notion of Tolerance and Human Rights. Essays in Honour of Raymond Klibansky*, éd. par Ethel Groffier et Michel Paradis (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1991).
- Une philosophie dans l'histoire. Hommages à Raymond Klibansky*, éd. par Bjarne Melkevik et Jean-Marc Narbonne (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2000).
- 'Ricordo di Raymond Klibansky', *Rivista di estetica XL*, nuova serie 15/3 (2000), 222-236, I: Michèle Le Doeuff, 'Raymond Klibansky – Periplo di un filosofo illustre' (222-229); II: Roberta De Manticelli, 'Della nobiltà dello spirito' (230-232); III: Federico Leoni: 'Della melancolia nella storia' (233-236).

4. Literature on Klibansky

- 'Bibliography of Raymond Klibansky', in *The Notion of Tolerance and Human Rights. Essays in Honour of Raymond Klibansky*, ed. by Ethel Groffier and Michel Paradis (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1991), pp. 165-174
- Michael J. Whalley et Désirée Park, 'Bibliography of Raymond Klibansky', in *Méthode et Philosophie de l'histoire. Hommage à Raymond Klibansky*, Numéro thématique de la *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 19/111-112 (1975), 167-174.
- Georges Leroux, *Hommage à Raymond Klibansky: De Nicolas de Cues aux enfants de Saturne. – Bibliographie des travaux de Raymond Klibansky – Curriculum vitae* (Paris: Gallimard, 1991).
- et: 'Bibliographie der Bücher und Aufsätze Raymond Klibanskys', in *Raymond Klibansky, Erinnerung an ein Jahrhundert. Gespräche mit Georges Leroux*. Aus dem Französischen von Petra

- Willim (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 2001), pp. 277-280.
- VV.AA., 'Professor Raymond Klibansky to Speak at Kalamazoo in 1986', *American Cusanus Society Newsletter* II/2 (1985), pp. 2-3 and III/1 (1986), p. 1.
- VV.AA., 'The Warburg Institute', *American Cusanus Society Newsletter*, III/2 (1986), 7-8.
- VV.AA., 'Professor Raymond Klibansky Interviewed in a French Publication' [= Préfaces 13 (Mai - juin 1989)], *American Cusanus Society Newsletter*, VI/2 (1989), p. 5.
- VV.AA., 'Mr. Richard Meiner, Publisher of Cusanus' Opera omnia and the Philosophische Bibliothek, Honored', *American Cusanus Society Newsletter*, VI/2 (1989), p. 15.
- VV.AA., 'Hommage à Raymond Klibansky', *American Cusanus Society Newsletter*, VIII/1 (1991), 8-9.
- Joe Bolton, 'Where's Raymond?' A review of 'Le Philosophe et la mémoire du siècle', *The New Criterion*, 17 (Janvier 1999), p. 78.
- Karl Bormann, (no title, on the Cusanus-Edition of the Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften), in *Ceterum censeo...*, cit., pp. 31-34.
- Gray C. Boyce, Review of: Raymond Klibansky, ed. *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies I/1*, in *The American Historical Review*, 47/2 (1942), 320-321.
- Roberta De Manticelli, 'Della nobiltà dello spirito' in *Rivista di estetica XL*, nuova serie 15/3 (2000), pp. 230-232.
- Luc Dietz, 'Das Jahrhundert im Spiegel. Zum 90. Geburtstag von Raymond Klibansky', *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, nr. 235 vom 14./15 (Octobre 1995), p. 34.
- Kurt Flasch, 'Laudatio auf den Preisträger Raymond Klibansky', in *Verleihung des Lessingpreises 1993 an Raymond Klibansky. Reden anlässlich der Preisübergabe* (Hamburg: Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, 1994), pp. 12-22.
- Thomas Göller, Review of: Raymond Klibansky, *Erinnerung an ein Jahrhundert. Gespräche mit Georges Leroux*, in *Philosophischer Literaturanzeiger*, 55/2 (2002), 150-154.
- Martin Grabmann, Review of: Nicolai de Cusa *Opera omnia*, Vol. I und II, in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung, Dritte Folge* (4) Heft 15 (9 April 1933), Spp. 685-692.
- Roland Hissette, 'In memoriam H. Bascour', *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale*, 32 (1990), 241.
- Ernst Hoffmann, (no title, Report on Klibansky's discovery of an unknown letter by Abaelard in cod. heidelbergensis 359, 8), *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Jahreshefte* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1930-31), IX.
- Thea Hoffmann, 'Wie die Cusanus-Ausgabe begann', *Mitteilungen und Forschungsbeiträge der Cusanus-Gesellschaft*, 5 (1965), 164-165.
- Margaretha Huber, 'Der Humanist. Raymond Klibansky plaudert mit Georges Leroux über die alte Zeit', *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, n. 192/22 (August, 2001), p. 16.
- Josef Koch, 'Kritische Bemerkungen zu Hildebrand Bascours neuer Ausgabe der Eckhart-Prologe', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 55 (1936), 264-285.
- Michèle Le Doeuff, 'Raymond Klibansky. Périple d'un philosophe illustre' [=Archéobibliographie Raymond Klibansky, first article], *Préfaces. Les idées et les sciences dans la bibliographie de la France*, 13 (May-June, 1989), pp. 125-131. Italian 'Raymond Klibansky. Periplo di un filosofo illustre' [=ricordo di Raymond Klibansky, first article], *Rivista di estetica XL*, nuova serie 15/3 (2000), 222-229.
- Federico Leoni, 'Della melancolia nella storia' [=ricordo di Raymond Klibansky, third article], *Rivista di estetica XL*, nuova serie 15/3 (2000), 233-236.
- Georges Leroux, *Hommage à Raymond Klibansky: De Nicolas de Cues aux enfants de Saturne. – Bibliographie des travaux de Raymond Klibansky. – Curriculum vitae* (Paris: Gallimard, 1991).
- Henri-Irénée Marrou, Review of: R. Klibansky, *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition*, *Revue du Moyen Âge Latin* 2 (1946), pp. 71-72.
- Richard McKeon, 'The meaning of Justice and the Relations among Traditions of Thought', in Contribution au projet d'un *Dictionnaire international des Termes fondamentaux de la Philosophie et de la Pensée politique* réalisé sous les auspices du Conseil international de Philosophie et des Sciences humaines avec l'aide de l'UNESCO. Published in *Revue inter-*

- nationale de philosophie* 11/41 (1957), 253-267 [= on Klibanskys project of a multilingual dictionary of philosophical terms].
- Martin Meyer, 'Die Macht des Wissens, das Wissen der Macht. Der Philosoph Raymond Klibansky erzählt aus seinem Leben', *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, Nr. 149 vom 30. Juni 2001, pp. 75.
- Thomas Meyer, 'Die Trennung zwischen Theorie und Praxis aufgeben. Der große Gelehrte Raymond Klibansky im Gespräch mit Georges Leroux', *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 161 vom 14 (July 2001), p. 20.
- Karen Michels, 'Ein scharfzüngiger Mystiker. Den unheilvollen Einfluß Saturns überwunden. Raymond Klibansky erhielt den Lessing-Preis', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 114 vom 18 (May 1994), p. N7.
- Dorothee Mussnug, *Die vertriebenen Heidelberger Dozenten. Zur Geschichte der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität nach 1933* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1988), On Klibansky: pp. 40-43, 148f u.ö.
- Gregorio Piaia, 'Un'eccezionale testimonianza di filosofia e vita: L'autobiografia di Raymond Klibansky', *Rivista di storia della filosofia*, 54/2 (2000), 275-279.
- John Rawls, Review of Raymond Klibansky (ed.), *Philosophy in the Mid-Century. A Survey*, *Philosophical Review*, 70/1 (1961), 131-132.
- Giovanni Santinello, 'Klibansky, Raymond', in *Enciclopedia filosofica. Centro di Studi Filosofici di Gallarate*, vol. 3 (Firenze: Sansoni, 1967), col. 1282-1283.
- Erich Seeberg, 'Eckhartiana I', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 56 (1937), 87-105.
- Erich Seeberg, 'Die verlorene Handschrift', in *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, 8 (1937), 386-397.
- Hans Gerhard Senger, 'Die kritische Edition der Werke des Nikolaus von Kues', *Akademie-Journal. Mitteilungsblatt der Konferenz der deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften*, 2/95 (1996), 5-10.
- Hans Gerhard Senger, 'Die Nikolaus-von-Kues-Ausgabe als Beispiel einer historisch-kritischen Edition', *Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung*, 38/1 (1984), 73-83.
- Michael Thimann, 'Es gibt viele Buchseiten diesseits des Rubikons. Wiederentdeckung der verschollenen Bibliothek: Vor den Nazis' with help of Klibansky; addition M.Th.] gerettet, vor der Zerstreuung bewahrt – die Caesar-Sammlung Friedrich Gundolfs in der Duke University von Durham, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 184 vom 11 (August 2001), p. 14.
- Morimichi Watanabe, 'The Origins of modern Cusanus Research in Germany and the Establishment of the Heidelberg "Opera omnia"', in Gerald Christianson and Thomas M. Izbicki, *Nicholas of Cusa in Search of God and Wisdom* (Leiden et al.: Brill, 1991), pp. 17-42.

5. Documentary film

- Anne-Marie Tougas, *Raymond Klibansky. De la philosophie à la vie*, un Film de Anne-Marie Tougas, (51 minutes), Office national du Film du Canada (2001).

Rafael Lapesa (1908 – 2001)

Miguel Ángel PÉREZ PRIEGO

(Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia – Spain)

Don Rafael Lapesa was the last direct representative of the Spanish School of Philology founded by Don Ramón Menéndez Pidal around the History Studies Centre in the early years of the 20th century. Lapesa joined the institution in 1927, proposed by Américo Castro, his history of language teacher, with a grant to work on the Glossary of Original Spanish under Don Ramón's direction. His ties to the Centre remained until the institution was dissolved at the end of the Civil War. And so Lapesa was trained in the Centre's positivist methodology of historicism, which essentially conceived and practised the science of philology as a broad field in which linguistic and literary phenomena and historical events were interpreted as being closely interconnected. To that complex, delicate programmatic task he was to devote his entire intellectual energy and, although it was as linguist and historian of the language that he did his most direct teaching and published many writings and an essential manual, his work in literary studies was also extensive and of prime importance.

At the History Studies Centre, in what we might call his first period, dominated by the unique professorship of Menéndez Pidal, the literary subjects of concern were the epic and the romances as traditional, national poetry. With Américo Castro and other, younger disciples (José F. Montesinos, Amado Alonso, Dámaso Alonso) the horizon opened out in search of other literary values and the recovery of a Spanish literature in its integrity. Those ideas are the origin of many works which try to prove the existence of a Spanish Renaissance, those written, for example, about the school of Erasmus, Cervantes or Góngora and the Baroque. Along the same lines, work which set out to broaden knowledge of the literature of the Middle Ages and study its individual values, particularly the authors of the 15th century, was produced.

The person who devoted himself most systematically and assiduously to those medieval studies was Rafael Lapesa, who has left us a wise analysis or commentary and a revealing contribution to many of those works and authors. Most of those studies date from the fifties, once the upheavals of the war and the postwar period had passed, and his academic activity in the chair of History of Language at the University of Madrid had calmed down. That was when he made his studies of the *Auto de los Reyes Magos*, following lines of research he had begun years before on the language of the 12th century, and most of all the numerous studies of 15th century poetry and the work of the Marqués de Santillana. Apart from a return to school subjects, such as the epic and the romances, or the new, exciting one on the *jarchas* (short verses in Mozarabic language), immediately assimilated into the old theories of traditional lyric poetry, the later works, from the sixties and seventies, are an opening up to new authors and genres, such as *El Libro de buen amor*, Juan de Lucena or the *Celestina* itself.

And so we may say that Rafael Lapesa's contribution to medieval literary studies has been fundamental, not only in the large number of works he published, but in the many lessons and courses he gave over so many years as a teacher. There was

no important subject, author or work of medieval literature that was unworthy of his attention as philologist and critic. Following the chronological order of subjects, we will list and comment on some of his main works.

The discovery of the *jarchas* and the difficulty of reading and interpreting them led to a precise study by Lapesa (1960) which, from the books and editions of Stern and García Gómez, tried to fix some passages in the text of those little lyrical poems, adducing linguistic forms documented in the peninsular romances of the time. In direct connection with that poetic stock, he would later pay attention to the copious repertory of traditional lyric poetry and would devote a broad, weighty review (1989) to Margit Frenk's magnum opus, *Corpus de la antigua lírica popular hispánica (siglos XV a XVII)* (Madrid, Castalia, 1987), which he used to recall the discovery and valuation of that autochthonous lyric poetry by Ramón Menéndez Pidal in 1919 and linked it to literary atmosphere of the Free Education Institute and the Students' Residence, where there was special interest in and enthusiasm for those poetic forms, assimilated by musicians and poets of the Generation of 27.

The world of the epic, connected to the romances, was studied by Lapesa in a documented article on the language of collections of lays and the old romances (1964). In it he defines and analyses the foremost features of epic language, such as the presence of linguistic archaisms, the stereotyped formulae in epithets or appositions, the variation in verb tenses to bring the minstrel's tale to life and the unusual liberties in the use of forms, syntactic constructions and vocabulary. All of them, as Lapesa concludes, subscribing to Don Ramón's doctrine on the epic, are stylistic procedures which, assimilated by the community of poets and listeners, help transform the individual work into a collective creation.

Faithful to the master's theories, he also devoted works to *El Cantar de Mio Cid*, one on the language (1980) and one on the chronology (1982) of the work, which to some extent brought a halt to the attacks by the anti-Pidal critics. As we know, the date of the *Cantar* has been a hotly debated question in recent times and 1207, which appears in the explicit of the manuscript, has been generally accepted, especially after the works by Ubieta, Pattison, Russell and Smith. Some of Ubieta's historical arguments and Pattison's linguistic ones are contested by Lapesa, who rejects the supposed Aragonese nature of the poem, as well as linguistic aspects held to be later, such as the presence of derivatives in *-ada*, *-ura*, with a concrete rather than abstract meaning (*arrancada*, *çelada*, *apreciadura*, *cintura*), which Pattison understands not to have appeared until the beginning of the 13th century, but which Lapesa documents in the 10th and 11th centuries. Likewise, he impugns historical arguments such as the anti-nobility stance reflected by the poem, not necessarily 'bourgeois' and more developed in Aragón; that of the hero's kinship with the kings of Spain; that of the name of Navarra, etc. Despite everything, the restraint of Lapesa's conclusion is exemplary: "The linguistic objections, therefore, lack foundation (...) I admit, however, that the conserved text may contain amendments and additions later than 1140, and even be a reshaping. I believe the original text would be more dialectical (...) would have archaisms (...) Mozarabisms (...) some Aragonese elements (...) But from the linguistic point of view there is no reason to think that the *Cantar* was written in Aragón. Nor am I inclined to accept it from the historical point of view (...) I have not tried to maintain that the text of the *Cantar de Mio Cid*, as we know it today, corresponds without alterations to the one written between 1140 and 1147."

At that original stage, the *Auto de los Reyes Magos* has also been scrutinised in detail by Lapesa who, in two works, far apart in time but nonetheless crucial (1954, 1983) has uncovered some of its most enigmatic mysteries, such as the origin of the author and the Toledo enclave of the work. From Toledo cathedral, from very ancient times, comes the codex conserved in the *Auto*, which contains in Latin the glosses of the *Song of Songs* and the *Lamentations of Jeremiah* by Gilberto de la Porrée (+1154), who stirred up a lengthy controversy about the dogma of the Trinity, rebuffed by St Bernard at the Council of Rheims (1148), whose resolutions were also promulgated in Toledo by Archbishop Raimundo. Starting from those facts, Lapesa has been able to give a highly plausible explanation of the material origin of the *Auto*: "it is likely that our 12th century codex (...) came there in the heat of the interest aroused by the controversy. That increases the possibility that it was Toledo where the two leftover pages of the manuscript were used as a basis for the text of the Mystery, which was performed annually in the cathedral." As for the language of the work, he has pointed out the strong French influence and has postulated the Gascon origin of the author, possibly a Gascon who had settled in Toledo.

From the great output of Alfonso the Wise, Lapesa paid particular attention to a work regarded as a minor one like the *Setenario* which, after his analysis of its symbolism and literary value, has seen its importance grow (1980). Also on the poetic work of King Alfonso he introduced some interpretative precision, as in the case of the brief composition that begins "Senhora, por amor Dios", the only one of the thirty profane cantigas written in Spanish. In a short article (1961-1966), Lapesa wisely interprets it not as a love poem but as a parody or joke, which would explain why the use of Galician, which was the traditional language of lyric poetry, has been momentarily abandoned in favour of Castilian.

From the 14th century his works on *El Libro de buen amor*, Chancellor Ayala or a less well-known author such as Fray Pedro Fernández Pecha are of decisive importance. Of *El Libro de buen amor* he particularly studied the subject of death in an article which clarifies and provides a complete interpretation of the work (1966). Indeed, the treatment of the subject reveals both the vitality of the character of Juan Ruiz, which prevails over the whole book, and the deep disquiet the feeling of death arouses in him. He has tried not to touch on that subject throughout almost the whole work, but now, when Trotaconventos dies, it seems he has no choice but to face up to it. However, that feeling of repulsion is what leads him to do so by means of a parodic lament which to some extent relieves that shudder of anxiety that ran through him.

About Pero López de Ayala he wrote a magnificent work of synthesis which was published as a chapter in the *Historia General de las Literaturas Hispánicas*, directed by Guillermo Díaz Plaja (1949). Lapesa studies the figure of the Chancellor in a world in political and social transition, in which he sees the values of the Middle Ages collapsing and records new forms of thought and action which herald a modern spirit. Similarly, his work, written when he was already over fifty, would have a depth and expressive vigour that enliven the satire and moralities of the *Rimado* and, in the case of the *Crónicas*, transform a Medieval narrative so that it gives way to more modern lines of psychological history. In a much later work (1986), Lapesa would also analyse four penitential poems inserted into the *Rimado*, in which the Chancellor updates the received spiritual and literary tradition and frames it in specific circumstances of his own life. Those poems are thus the first example of deep individual religious emotion to appear in Castilian letters.

As for Fray Pedro Fernández Pecha, an Alcarria friar and founder of the Order of St Jerome, Lapesa devoted a revealing article to him (1975), in which he emphasised his deep inner religiousness and the contrived stylistic construction of his *Soliloquios*. Those were a surprising example of religious prose, peppered with rhetorical resources (amplifications, parallelisms, rhymes, antitheses, etc.) which took up and heightened the ornamental procedures he had been introducing into preaching and reading by the patristic tradition.

Undoubtedly the chapter of medieval history that has most benefited from Lapesa's studies and which, as a result, has enjoyed the greatest critical renewal is the poetry of the 15th century. The generation of the first court poets of the *Cancionero de Baena* was studied in an article that clarifies their literary language (1953). In it he analyses the use of Galician as a literary language by the poets of the first generation, its decline when love lyrics ceased to be the favourite genre in the first decades of the 15th century and its return as a deliberate archaism in the poets of the courts of Juan II and Alfonso V. Along the same lines, in a wise, well-documented work (1962), he studied the connections of the poetry of the 15th century song anthologies with the Italian style poetry of the Renaissance and the continuity of many of its subjects and motifs. Full of ideas in this field, he studied the literary configuration of the different poetic genres and the progress of certain mythological themes in works such as "Los géneros líricos del Renacimiento: la herencia cancioneresca" (1998), "Poesía docta y afectividad en las 'consolatorias' de Gómez Manrique" (1979), "Cartas y dezires o lamentaciones de amor: desde Santillana y Mena hasta don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza" (1989), or "Sobre el mito de Narciso en la lírica medieval y renacentista" (1988). He has also studied in depth the work of the main poets, such as Santillana, Mena or Imperial.

To Francisco Imperial he devoted a fundamental study of the chronology of his works, his Italian sources and the use of the hendecasyllable (1953). In another fundamental work on Juan de Mena (1959), he studied the ethical motive as main structural element in the construction of Mena's complex poem. The *Laberinto*, Lapesa emphasises, was conceived by the Cordoban poet as an instrument to make the Castilian knights of the time aware of their glorious destiny and to serve them in the exercise of virtue. That noble morality, aimed at the defenders, at the "powerful" (neither churchmen nor humble people are mentioned in the work) is of vital importance in the arrangement of the work in circles or orders occupied by virtuous people or sinners, from past and present, but whose name and numbers are continually varied or even silenced, for that very moral intention that guides the poet and allows him to stretch or abbreviate, to add or suppress according to the set of moral values he wants to propose.

The work of the Marqués de Santillana has been the one studied most intensely and extensively by Lapesa in a series of works he produced over a period of almost thirty years, clear proof of his particular concern for the figure of the poet of the *Serranillas*. Lapesa had already declared that interest when he devoted his maiden speech at the Academy to the Marqués' narrative sayings (1954), which was immediately followed by articles on other aspects of his work, such as the date of the *Comedieta de Ponza* (1954), his youthful poetry (1954) or the hendecasyllable of the sonnets (1956-57), culminating in what is still the best monograph on the author, *La obra literaria del Marqués de Santillana*, Madrid, Ínsula, 1957. At that time, too, and

still in later years fundamental studies of works such as *Los Proverbios* (1957), *El Bías* (1957) or the *Serranillas* (1958, 1978) would see the light of day.

Of course, the contributions made by those works are numerous and have given us back a far more precise vision and assessment of Santillana's work than critical tradition had established up to then. On the *Serranillas*, for example, Lapesa has shown them to us as a fascinating poetic cycle, perfectly ordered in artistic sequence and varied in their stylistic features. Of the songs and sayings, he has clearly established their literary originality, often with regard to their French or Italian models. In the case of the sonnets, Lapesa has established a secure chronology and has given the whys and wherefores of what was still an immature attempt on the part of the medieval poet. With the *Proverbios*, he has tracked down the extraordinary range of sources, from the Bible, the *Flos sanctorum* or St Augustine to classical historians such as Livy and Valerius Maximus, poets such as Ovid, Lucan and Statius, and most of all the moral writings of Cicero and Seneca, apart from Medieval repertoires such as John Waleys' *Breviloquium de quatuor virtutibus* or Walter Burley's *De vita et moribus philosophorum*, and has valued them, rather than as a philological and humanistic concern, as an exemplary cultural synthesis. Lapesa has shown us the *Bías contra Fortuna* as a poem of high literary quality, a poetic exposition of Stoic morality, learned from the works of Seneca, but also from Petrarch's *De remediis utriusque Fortunae*, which in many of its postulates is in opposition to Christian morality (virtue alone as supreme good or the justification of suicide) and in others he even goes beyond the philosophy of the Portico (the hope of a future life), all of which means a great effort to recreate a purely pagan ideology, aside from the Christian ideology in which the author and his time were immersed.

Lapesa also devoted a number of works to 15th century prose. One early one was about the language of the *Amadís* manuscript (1956), in which he analyses some linguistic features of the fragments of the work found by Rodríguez Moñino, which he places chronologically around 1420. To a figure as interesting as Juan de Lucena, he devoted a documented article (1965) which analyses aspects of Lucena's feelings and thought which reflect the crisis of the convert when trying to become a member of the dominant society (adhesion to the forms of private piety, criticism of the temporal power of the church, sense of the common good, anti-aristocratic satire, bitter pessimism, doubts about the immortality of the soul). He also reconstructs the fragments of an essay in defence of the Jews, which was harshly attacked by Canon Alfonso Ortiz and has not been conserved, and publishes for the first time a brief treatise by Lucena on the origin and pre-eminence of the office of herald, written in a rhetorical and Latinate style in which the author plays with the names and myths of Antiquity.

La Celestina also provided Lapesa with an object of study. Apart from two extensive commentaries on the classic studies by M^a Rosa Lida de Malkiel and Américo Castro, he devoted a penetrating article to the immortal work in which he studies a monologue by Calisto (1972). In it he makes an in-depth study of the characters, in particular Calisto's. He points out how in Act I they are drawn with sharp penetration in their complex, contradictory souls, but how Fernando de Rojas would delve even more deeply into the characters, gradually motivating their intimate transformation. The case of Calisto is revealing, since from irresolute lover crushed by the passion of Act I, he becomes a far more complex figure, as shown particularly in his two parallel monologues in Acts XIII and XIV. In the second, especial-

ly, he notes a marked psychological complexity and a greater play of self-analysis and self-suggestion as the character is torn between the social duties of honour and the value he acknowledges in pleasure enjoyed.

As we have shown in this review, Lapesa broadened the framework of the philological school in which he had been trained and, with his work, revised almost all the chapters of Medieval Spanish Literature. He did so with the wisdom of the philosopher and the sensibility of the true humanist. He approached the critical problems first from the rigour of text criticism and a deep knowledge of the history of the language and then went back to a most perspicacious analysis of themes, genres and styles. He provided us with a vision of philological studies in their full scope and complexity, but also in their wealth and human depth. For Professor Lapesa managed to transcend the coldness of the letter and always tried to unravel the behaviour of the human soul from creative forms. As he himself once said, summing up his immense, exemplary dedication in a few words: "I have neither faith nor hope in analyses which set out to understand literary creations while dispensing with their creators; that is why I prefer to remain in the line of the humanities which have not been dehumanised."

Chronology

- 1908. Rafael Lapesa Melgar was born in Valencia, Spain, on 8th February.
- 1916. He and his family moved to Madrid. He did his secondary school at the Instituto Cardenal Cisneros (1917-1923), and read Philosophy and Letters at the Universidad de Madrid.
- 1927. He obtained the degree in Philosophy and Letters from the Universidad de Madrid. Entered the Centro de Estudios Históricos as an intern, where he soon rose to the position of collaborator (1929-1939).
- 1930. He obtained his lectureship in Spanish Language and Literature for secondary schools after a number of examinations, and he taught at state public secondary schools in Madrid (1932-1941), Oviedo (1942) and Salamanca (1942-1947).
- 1931. He was awarded his PhD in Philosophy and Letters.
- 1932. He married Pilar Lago Couceiro, a colleague of his at university and a collaborator.
- 1942. First edition of his *Historia de la Lengua Española*, re-elaborated and expanded in successive years several times.
- 1947. He obtained the Chair of Historical Grammar of the Spanish Language at the Universidad de Madrid, a post he occupied till his death. He started working for the Real Academia Española's Lexicography Seminar, of which he became the Director in 1969.
- 1948. Visiting Professor at Princeton University. In subsequent years he would be appointed Visiting Professor in other North American universities (Harvard, Yale, California, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin). He taught courses and gave talks in many other universities in Latin America and Europe.
- 1949. He was appointed numerary member of the Real Academia Española, where he occupied the chair for the letter 'k'.
- 1964. He was appointed Secretary of the Real Academia Española, an appointment he resigned from in 1971.
- 1974. President of the Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas.
- 1978. When he turned seventy, he had to resign his Professorship at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, although he continued tutoring PhD works and teaching at the Colegio Libre de Eméritos.
- 1982. He was appointed member of the Real Academia de la Historia.

1983. Premio Nacional de Investigación.

1986. He is awarded the Spanish Príncipe de Asturias prize for the Letters.

2001. He died in Madrid, on 1st February.

Selected bibliography

1. Books

Historia de la lengua española, prólogo de Ramón Menéndez Pidal, (1st ed. Madrid: Escelicer, 1942).

Introducción a los estudios literarios (Barcelona: Rauter, 1947; Salamanca: Anaya, 1964; Salamanca: Anaya, 1970; Madrid: Cátedra, 1974).

La trayectoria poética de Garcilaso (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1948; 2nd. ed. rev. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1968).

La obra literaria del marqués de Santillana (Madrid: Ínsula, 1957)

Serranillas/ Marqués de Santillana, ed. (Santander, 1958).

De la Edad Media a nuestros días: estudios de historia literaria (Madrid: Gredos, 1967).

Poetas y prosistas de ayer y de hoy: veinte estudios de historia y crítica literarias (Madrid: Gredos, 1977).

Estudios de historia lingüística española (Madrid: Paraninfo, 1985).

Páginas escogidas: estudios lingüísticos, literarios y estilísticos (1987)

De Ayala a Ayala: estudios literarios y estilísticos (Madrid: Istmo, 1988).

Léxico e historia (Madrid: Istmo, 1992).

El español moderno y contemporáneo: estudios lingüísticos (Barcelona: Crítica, 1996).

De Berceo a Jorge Guillén (Madrid: Gredos, 1997).

2. Articles

‘El Canciller de Ayala’, in *Historia General de las Literaturas Hispánicas*, ed. by Guillermo Díaz Plaja, vol. 1 (Barcelona: Barna, 1949) pp. 493-515.

‘La lengua de la poesía lírica desde Macías a Villasandino’, *Romance Philology*, 7 (1953), 51-59.

‘Notas sobre Micer Francisco Imperial’, in *Homenaje a Amado Alonso, Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 7 (1953), 337-351.

Los decires narrativos del Marqués de Santillana (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1954).

‘Sobre la fecha de la Comedieta de Ponza’, *Archivum*, 4 (1954), 81-86.

‘La cultura literaria activa en la poesía juvenil de Santillana’, *Atlante*, 2 (1954), 119-125.

‘Sobre el Auto de los Reyes Magos: sus rimas anómalas y el posible origen de su autor’, in *Homenaje a Fritz Krüger*, ed. by Toribio M. Lucero and Alfredo Dornheim, vol. 2 (Mendoza: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, 1954), pp. 591-599.

‘El lenguaje del Amadís manuscrito’, *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 36 (1956), 219-225.

‘El endecasílabo en los sonetos de Santillana’, *Romance Philology*, 10 (1956-57), 180-185.

La obra literaria del Marqués de Santillana (Madrid: Ínsula, 1957).

‘Los Proverbios de Santillana. Contribución al estudio de sus fuentes’, *Hispanófila*, 1 (1957).

‘Un gran poema estoico del Marqués de Santillana’, *Ínsula*, 12 (1957), p. 130.

‘El elemento moral en el Laberinto de Mena: su influjo en la disposición de la obra’, in *Joseph E. Gillet. Memorial Volume, Hispanic Review*, 27 (1959).

‘Sobre el texto y lenguaje de algunas jarchas mozárabes’, *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 40 (1960), 53-65.

‘¿Amor cortés o parodia? A propósito de la primitiva lírica castellana’, in *Estudis de Llatí Medieval i de Filologia Romànica dedicats a la memòria de Lluís Nicolau d'Olwer, Estudis Romànics*, 2 (1961-1966).

- 'Poesía de cancionero y poesía italianizante', in *Srenae. Estudios de Filología e Historia dedicados al Profesor Manuel García Blanco. Acta Salmanticensia*, 16 (1962).
- 'La lengua de la poesía épica en los cantares de gesta y en el romancero viejo', *Anuario de Letras*, 4 (1964).
- 'Sobre Juan de Lucena: escritos suyos mal conocidos o inéditos', in *Collected Studies in honour of Américo Castro's Eightieth Year*, ed. by Marcel P. Hornik (Oxford: Lincombe Lodge Research Library, 1965).
- 'El tema de la muerte en el Libro de buen amor', in *Estudios dedicados a James Homer Herriot*, ed. by the University of Wisconsin (Valencia, 1966).
- 'En torno a un monólogo de Calisto', in *Homenaje a Aranguren*, ed. by Mariano Aguilar Navarro (Madrid: Ediciones de la Revista de Occidente, 1972).
- 'Un ejemplo de prosa retórica a fines del siglo XIV: los *Soliloquios* de Fray Pedro Fernández Pecha', in *Studies in Honor of Lloyd A. Kasten* (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1975).
- 'De nuevo sobre las serranillas de Santillana', in *Libro-homenaje a Antonio Pérez Gómez*, vol. 2, (Cieza [Murcia]: La Fonte que Mana y Corre, 1978) pp. 43-50.
- 'Poesía docta y afectividad en las 'consolatorias' de Gómez Manrique', in *Estudios sobre Literatura y Arte dedicados al Profesor Emilio Orozco Díaz*, vol. 2 (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1979), pp. 231-239.
- 'Símbolos y palabras en el *Setenario* de Alfonso X', in *In memoriam Raimundo Lida. Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 29 (1980), 247-261.
- 'Sobre el *Cantar de Mio Cid*. Crítica de críticas', in *Estudios de historia lingüística española*, (Madrid: Paraninfo, 1984), pp. 11-42 (recollected from *Études de Philologie Romane et d'Histoire Littéraire offerts à Jules Horrent* (Liège: J.-M. D'Heur, 1980), pp. 213-231, and *Essays on Narrative Fiction in the Iberian Peninsula in Honour of Frank Pierce*, (Oxford: The Dolphin Book, 1982) pp. 55-6.
- 'Las *serranillas* del Marqués de Santillana', in *El comentario de textos*, 4. *La poesía medieval*, ed. by Manuel Alvar and others (Madrid: Castalia, Literatura y Sociedad, 1983), pp. 243-276.
- 'Mozárabe y catalán o gascón en el *Auto de los Reyes Magos*', en *Miscellània Aramon i Serra*, ed. by Manuel Jorba (Barcelona: Curial, 1983), pp. 277-94.
- 'Las rimas penitenciales del Canciller Ayala: tradición y elemento personal', en *Homenaje a Pedro Sáinz Rodríguez*, vol. 2 (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1986), pp. 391-403.
- 'Sobre el mito de Narciso en la lírica medieval y renacentista', *Epos*, 4 (1988), 9-20.
- '*Cartas y deziros o lamentaciones de amor*: desde Santillana y Mena hasta don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza', in *Symbolae Pisanae. Studi in onore di Guido Mancini*, ed. by Blanca Perinián and Francesco Guazzelli (Pisa: Giardini, 1989), pp. 295-310.
- 'Los géneros líricos del Renacimiento: la herencia cancioneresca', in *Homenaje a Eugenio Asensio*, ed. by Luisa López Grigera and Augustin Redondo (Madrid: Gredos, 1998), pp. 259-275.

3. Publications about Rafael Lapesa

- Studia hispanica in honorem R. Lapesa*, 3 vols (Madrid: Gredos, 1972, 1974 and 1975).
- Homenaje al profesor Lapesa: XI Curso de Lingüística Textual, Murcia 25-29 abril 1988* (Murcia: Universidad, 1990).

Robert S. Lopez (1910 – 1985)

Paul FREEDMAN
(Yale University)

It is a great pleasure for me to have been asked to prepare this paper on the career of Robert Lopez. I never knew or met him, to my regret. My pleasure is, nevertheless, partly derived from a certain *pietas* as he taught at my university and was closely involved with its intellectual life from his first appointment in 1946 to his death in 1986. I have benefitted from Professor Lopez' carefully collected correspondence which is in the archives of Yale University and from the information and fascinating recollections provided by Mme. Claude Lopez. The assignment given by Santiago Aurell and the other organizers of this conference also has led me to consider the study of medieval commerce especially in America, the reasons for its recent neglect, and some hopeful signs of a restored appreciation¹.

Robert (born Roberto) Lopez was emblematic of the accomplishments of a great generation of American medievalists and yet an exceptional figure in his own right. He was only the second Jewish faculty member of Yale College, and was active at the University at a time when it remained a bastion of at least the remnants of the American ruling class. His career at Yale was extremely successful. He was able not only to turn out students and occupy a leading position in the historical profession but to create an interdisciplinary program in Medieval Studies. Lopez was one of a number of Jewish émigré scholars whose flight from the threat of repression and extermination rejuvenated and in some cases created academic fields in the United States². German academic refugees dominated such fields as Renaissance intellectual history (Paul Oskar Kristeller), medieval canon law (Stephan Kuttner), political and religious theory (Ernst Kantorowicz) and medieval art history (Ernst Kitzinger, Kurt Weizmann).

Lopez was of course from Italy and so rather different in his outlook and experience from the better-chronicled German-Jewish scholars. He was much more drawn to Italy throughout his American career than were German scholars to their former homeland. Few of the latter seriously contemplated returning, and those

¹ Lopez has received considerable attention from historians, almost exclusively in Italy. See Pietro Zerbi, 'El Medioevo emisferico: Roberto S. Lopez', in Zerbi's collection of essays, *Il medioevo nella storiografia degli ultimi vent'anni* (Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1985), pp. 205-301; Franco Cardini and Giosué Musca, 'Ricordo di Roberto Sabatino Lopez', *Quaderni medievali*, 22 (December 1986), 5-20; introduction by Gabriella Airal di to a reprint of Lopez' first book, *Benedetto Zaccaria, ammiraglio e mercante nella Genova del Duecento* (Florence: Camunia, 1996), pp. v-xxiv; essays presented in *Il medioevo degli orizzonti aperti, Atti della giornata di studio per Roberto S. Lopez*, ed. Gabriella Airal di (Genova: Comune di Genova, 1989); and Daniella Romagnoli, 'Il Medioevo: uno stato d'animo? Riflessioni sull'opera di Roberto Sabatino Lopez', in *Il mestiere dello storico del medioevo*, ed. Francesco Santi (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1992), pp. 39-71. I have not seen Catia Cominetti *Il Medioevo di Roberto Lopez: linee portanti e fortuna storiografica* (unpublished doctoral thesis, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano, 1993).

² In general on this subject, Lewis A. Coser, *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).

who did often regretted it. Lopez was both very devoted to and yet alien at Yale. He was never completely at home in the United States, a place in which he flourished and was very influential, but American academic culture was perhaps not witty enough, and the country as a whole was more entranced by technology (he never really learned to drive), more than intellectual acuity. In 1945 his American Ph.D. advisor, Professor Robert Reynolds, wrote from Wisconsin to urge him not to be discouraged by the difficult academic job market, adding, 'Gosh, Bob, do not count on going back to Italy for a career'³.

Lopez stayed in the United States. His greatest temptation to leave, as it happens, came quite a bit later, at the height of his career in 1969 with the offer of the Chichele Chair at Oxford, one of the grandest academic titles in that venerable university, but the prestige of the title did not outweigh practical and intellectual considerations that kept Lopez at Yale⁴.

Robert Lopez remained above all Italian and a loyal son of Genoa even though his family moved to Milan shortly after his birth. It is appropriate that "Va pensiero", the great lament of exile from Verdi's *Nabucco*, was sung at his memorial service at Yale. A chorus of longing sung by the Jewish exiles in Babylon, it was also taken as an anthem of Italian aspirations of the *Risorgimento* and later by those forced to leave the beloved *patria* in the Mussolini era. Lopez never attempted to disguise or minimize his Jewish background, but this had less prominence in his own self-estimation than his Genoese origin. The Sephardic name confused people in the United States to the extent that at Brooklyn College, part of the municipal university system of New York City, he was asked in 1944 to teach not only history but a course in Introductory Spanish as well, it being assumed from his name that this was his native language. Things being what they were at that time, he didn't inform the administrative authorities that far from being a native speaker, he had no more than a reading knowledge of Spanish. He taught Spanish for a semester, staying a bit ahead of his beginning students.

An indication of Lopez' sentiments can be seen in the furor that arose over the so-called Vinland Map, a map in the possession of Yale's Beinecke Library that purports to show both Cathay and the presence of a substantial territory lying between Europe, Iceland, Greenland and East Asia. The acquisition of this previously unknown map by Yale in 1965 caused great excitement as it seemed to demonstrate the Scandinavian presence in the New World, now universally accepted on the basis of archeological evidence, but then still regarded as a revolutionary assertion. If indeed the Vinland Map dated from the fifteenth century, its evidence for the preservation of the knowledge of a trans-Atlantic territory beyond the period of Viking exploration would be notable and unique. As it stands, while never having definitively been proven a fake, the map's authenticity is doubtful⁵. At any rate, long before such questions arose, and at the height of what amounted to a popular fas-

³ Yale University Archives (henceforth YUA), MS 1459, Robert Lopez papers, Reynolds to Lopez, 12 July 1945.

⁴ YUA, Lopez Papers, correspondence with Prince Dimitri Obolensky and Sir Ronald Syme.

⁵ Lopez contributed some brief, skeptical observations under the title 'The Case is not Settled' to the volume dedicated to the map edited by Wilcomb E. Washburn, *Proceedings of the Vinland Map Conference* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), pp. 31-34.

cination with the Vinland Map, Lopez walked into a medieval history class one October 12, celebrated as a holiday, Columbus Day, in the United States, and drawing a map of Italy with its major towns, commented on marking Genoa, that it was the birthplace of the discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus, and of some other eminent people⁶.

I should like to outline Robert Lopez' career before undertaking an evaluation of his contributions. We thus begin, *à propos* Columbus, with Genoa where Roberto Lopez was born on 8 October 1910. His father Sabatino Lopez was a noted playwright and man of letters, a friend and advocate of the work of Luigi Pirandello and in his own right one of the major literary figures of interwar Italy. As Roberto's brother Guido has recalled, Roberto was precocious but not in the way of a musical or mathematical genius, rather as a boy of extraordinary and miscellaneous knowledge. He entranced and amused adults with his conversation, but also was maddening to his school teachers, for he was vigorously interested in the subjects he wanted to study while completely uninterested in others. He tended to be brash, amusing, impatient, and rather deliberately sloppy, with a reputation, as one of his teachers reported to his parents, as a chatterbox, a clown and someone who was always late ("chiacchierone, burlone, ritarditario")⁷. His abilities eventually triumphed over what were regarded as his shortcomings and he began and rapidly advanced as a journalist. Although he started to publish articles in major Italian newspapers on a variety of topics, he soon came to realize the unpleasant compromises that would be necessary to sustain such a profession in an increasingly repressive political climate. Encouraged by his maternal uncle Guido Tabet, an engineer in Genoa with interests in the history of that city, Roberto became increasingly devoted to the study of medieval history and obtained a degree from the University of Milan in 1932. His *tesi di laurea* was on the Genoese merchant adventurer Benedetto Zaccaria.

In some ways Lopez' Italian career paralleled his American one, an initial period of what he regarded as insecure academic exile followed by a more established appointment. Academic positions in Cagliari and Pavia were followed by a considerably more congenial post at the University of Genoa in 1935. From 1933 and his first book based on his Milanese thesis until his departure for England in February 1939, Lopez produced a spate of articles and monographs on the history of Genoa, and its Mediterranean colonies⁸. His studies of Genoese economic history were based on the massive notarial records of the Archivio di Stato which allowed him to reconstruct how the commercial enterprises that supported Genoa actually worked. Rather than relying on the grand narrative of Genoa's political history or

⁶ For this story I am grateful to Mr. Ronald Knox, a former graduate student teaching assistant of Robert Lopez' at Yale. In the preface to his *The Birth of Europe* (New York: M. Evans and Co., 1967), p. 4, Lopez excuses himself for devoting particular attention in the book to the Mediterranean regions: "I was born in Genoa, and live and teach in the United States; if Christopher Columbus was no less a Genoese for having discovered America, his humble fellow-countryman can hardly be expected to preserve an indifferent neutrality. . ."

⁷ Guido Lopez, an appreciation given at the memorial gathering at Yale, 18 October, 1986.

⁸ Notably *Genova marinara nel Duecento: Benedetto Zaccaria ammiraglio e mercante* (Messina & Milano: G. Principato, 1933), reprinted as *Benedetto Zaccaria, ammiraglio e mercante nella Genova del Duecento* (Florence: Camunia, 1996); *Studi sull'economia genovese nel medio evo* (Torino: S. Lattes, 1936); and *Storia delle colonie genovesi nel mediterraneo*, (Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1938, reprinted Genova: Marietti, 1996). Lopez was the first non-French contributor to the *Annales* with 'Aux origines du capitalisme génois', *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale*, 9 (1937), 429-54.

the sort of general survey of its rivalries with Venice or Barcelona, Lopez looked at how merchants built their operations, at the contracts they entered into, at the goods they handled, and how they dealt with the risks and uncertainties of a dangerous but potentially profitable trade.

In an article written in 1948 reviewing a collection of Armando Saporì's articles on economic history, Lopez distinguished two methods of reconstructing the history of medieval economic progress: that of beginning with a grand hypothesis based on a small number of facts, and a reverse process by which conclusions are reached by first searching for as much data as possible, thinking about their implications in separate and discrete studies, and drawing conclusions only after such voluminous material has been thoroughly considered. The great founders of modern medieval economic history, Pirenne, Sombart, Dopsch, represented the first way of proceeding, but Lopez extolled the work of Italian scholars such as Saporì and Gino Luzzato as a model that would substitute authoritative and nuanced information for "flimsy, if brilliant, general conclusions"⁹.

Lopez collected information from the most routine kinds of sources to come up with an overall picture of commerce, but one with considerable detail and anecdotes. An article on Genoese merchants in the farthest reaches of Asia begins by remarking that even the most arid and unpromising notarial documents offer interesting and unexpected insights into human character and the social and economic environment of the Middle Ages¹⁰. This could serve as an encapsulation of both method and goals pursued by Lopez in his research. The result was not only a grand synthesis of medieval economic enterprise but intriguing questions and anecdotes from who actually invented pasta (developed independently by Italians and not imported from China), to the lives of Italian merchants residing in India and China¹¹.

The use of archival and in particular notarial records in Genoa was the basis for a large number of articles in the 1930s on particular topics of medieval commerce, but in the years after Lopez was forced to leave Italy, his earlier research in Genoa sustained larger conclusions addressed to audiences more interested in the implications of Genoese economic history than in the lore of the city itself. Lopez would undoubtedly have been a great and pioneering historian no matter where he had spent his career, but the uprooting of his life oriented his research towards larger and more comparative questions than he had asked in the 1930s, questions which his labors in the Genoese Archivio di Stato now equipped him to answer.

The Italian anti-Semitic laws had been imposed with Mussolini's alliance with Hitler and strengthened with the impact of the Reichskristallnacht of November 1938. In early 1939 Lopez was able to obtain temporary refuge in England with the intent to emigrate to the United States. The conductor Arturo Toscanini, a figure

⁹ 'Italian Leadership in the Medieval Business World', *Journal of Economic History*, 8 (1948), 63-68.

¹⁰ 'In quibuscumque mundi partibus', in *Miscellanea di storia italiana e mediterranea per Nino Lamboglia* (Genova: 1978), p. 347.

¹¹ 'Chi ha inventato gli spaghetti?', in Lopez, *Su e giù per la storia di Genova* (Genova: Università di Genova, 1975), pp. 381-83; 'European Merchants in the Medieval Indies: The Evidence of Commercial Documents', *Journal of Economic History*, 3 (1943), 164-84; 'L'extrême frontière du commerce de l'Europe médiévale', *Le Moyen Age*, 69 (1963), 479-90; 'Nouveaux documents sur les marchands italiens en Chine à l'époque mongole', *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1977), 445-57.

of high culture who occupied an exceptional place in American life, wrote on Lopez' behalf to U.S. Ambassador Joseph Kennedy asking Kennedy's aid with the notoriously indifferent U.S. immigration authorities¹². Kennedy (father to the future president), not a great friend of those opposed to Hitler or Mussolini, nevertheless did attempt some sort of intervention, but as Lopez was diagnosed as having the eye disease trachoma, entry was denied until he could have an operation.

The other condition for permission to emigrate was that Lopez have a job awaiting him in the U.S. He was able to obtain a position as research assistant to the medieval historian Robert Reynolds at the University of Wisconsin which also allowed him to acquire within two years an American doctoral degree. To arrive from Europe with only a change from ship terminal to bus station in New York before settling into the deep reaches of interior America must have been a shock. Lopez' profound gratitude towards Reynolds in later years does not seem to have extended towards any very nostalgic reminiscences of Wisconsin, although in fact it has always been one of the premier universities of the United States, especially in the study of history and the social sciences.

Obtaining his doctorate from the University of Wisconsin in 1942, Lopez attempted to join the U.S. army but his Italian origin automatically made him an "enemy alien". By the peculiar logic of wartime regulations, he was allowed instead to work for the Office of War Information in New York broadcasting to Italy. Showing a flair for his first career choice, journalism, he was quickly appointed to the second highest spot in the section (the director was always an American citizen). He resigned from his position in protest against the American government's negotiations with general Badoglio after the fall of Mussolini.

In New York, just after leaving Wisconsin in 1942, he met his future wife, Claude-Anne Kirschen. Having barely escaped from Nazi-occupied Belgium via Spain, she attended Columbia University and worked for the exiled Byzantine historian Henri Grégoire, editor of the journal *Byzantion* for which Lopez wrote one of his first scholarly articles in English on the spread of Byzantine law¹³.

The war years brought uncertainties and frustrations and Lopez had at first to settle for temporary academic positions at Columbia University and Brooklyn College. Nevertheless he was able to change very quickly from publishing entirely in Italian and on Genoese themes to articles in English and American journals of medieval studies and economic history that dealt with what were considered great subjects beyond the world of one city. After what might be called a transitional essay on 'The English and the Manufacture of Writing Materials in Genoa', published in 1940, Lopez undertook articles on a variety of topics such as a study of European merchants in the Indies, and a contribution to the leading American journal *Speculum* on the Byzantine silk industry¹⁴. But it was another article for *Speculum* during the war that garnered most attention and established Lopez within the English-speaking world as an authority on the hotly debated topic of the econom-

¹² Letter of Arturo Toscanini to Ambassador Joseph Kennedy, dated 6 May 1939. I am grateful to Mme. Lopez for showing me a copy of this letter.

¹³ 'Byzantine Law in the Seventh Century and its Reception by the Germans and the Arabs', *Byzantion*, 16 (1942-1943), 445-61.

¹⁴ 'The English and the Manufacture of Writing Materials in Genoa', *Economic History Review*, 10 (1940), 132-37; 'European Merchants in the Medieval Indies' (as above, note 11); 'Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire', *Speculum*, 20 (1945), 1-42.

ic basis for the transition between the classical and medieval world. 'Mohammed and Charlemagne: A Revision' was a revaluation of the famous Pirenne Thesis in light of Byzantine and Arab evidence¹⁵. It argued for looking in more detail at the Mediterranean world than Pirenne and his successor Dopsch had done, and offered a more sophisticated account of numismatic and economic evidence. Lopez did not dispute the decline of Mediterranean commerce from the fifth to ninth centuries, especially Pirenne's "four disappearances" (papyrus, luxury cloths, spices, and gold currency), but showed that this was not due exclusively or even primarily to the Arab conquests but rather to Byzantine trade policies and the overall poverty of the former Roman West. The Pirenne Thesis would be debated for decades and has recently had a new life if not as a completely credible theory, at least as a template for how to look at the end of the Roman world¹⁶. Lopez shifted the argument from Pirenne's geopolitical perspective (the rise of northern Europe and the decline of the Mediterranean, symbolized by Charlemagne) to one more focused on the actual complex course of culture, consumption and trade in the South¹⁷.

On the basis of his European reputation and as a recognition of the importance of medieval economic history at a time when the dominant aspect of medieval history in America was political and constitutional history, Lopez was appointed at Yale University in 1946 as a beginning (assistant) professor, with full, if probationary, status within the History Department. Hiring Lopez might seem a rather uncharacteristically daring move for a university still very insular, traditional in its customs and orientation towards the training of an undergraduate social elite. In the 1960s Yale College (the undergraduate division) would start to admit more than its previous handful of Jewish and subsequently African-American applicants. It accepted women as undergraduates for the first time in 1969. The appointment of historians who were Jewish such as Peter Gay and John Blum signaled a new openness to people without previous Yale connections. But in 1946 this was very much in the future.

In some ways, of course, Yale was receiving high value for a rather small investment. To have a beginning professor who was already the author of three books and numerous articles must have had some attraction. In addition, American universities, however insular, had hired European émigré scholars not only in the humanities but of course quite obviously in the sciences, a practice that, among other things, aided in the development of nuclear weapons (Fermi, Einstein, Szilard, Teller), so that by 1946 Lopez would have seemed exotic to Yale, but not strikingly so.

What is perhaps more interesting is how well Lopez fit into Yale despite its upper-class, American Protestant traditionalism and social conformity. Despite some doubts about how secure his position there would be¹⁸, Lopez did achieve "tenure" (job-

¹⁵ 'Mohammed and Charlemagne: A Revision', *Speculum*, 18 (1943), 14-38.

¹⁶ Especially Richard Hodges and David Whitehouse, *Mohammed, Charlemagne and the Origins of Europe: Archaeology and the Pirenne Thesis* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), and Michael McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, AD 300-900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

¹⁷ For later reflections on Pirenne, see 'Quarant'anni dopo Pirenne', in *Settimane di studio CISAM*, 25: *La navigazione mediterranea nell'Alto Medioevo* (Spoleto: CISAM, 1978), pp. 15-31.

¹⁸ He expresses some of these concerns in a letter to Professor Grey C. Boyce at Northwestern University, YUA, Lopez Papers, letter dated 14 June 1948.

security) and promotion to the rank of associate professor in 1950, relatively quickly. He was made a full professor in 1955 and was given an endowed professorship ("Durfee Professor") in 1962 and made "Sterling Professor", the highest named professorship at Yale, in 1970.

Lopez could be charming, witty, affectionate and a keen observer of human nature. He was also on occasion impatient and abrasive. As the English phrase has it, he didn't "suffer fools gladly". Lopez himself acknowledged having a "vivacity of reactions to disappointment"¹⁹. His heart was in the Graduate School, cradle of future historians, and he spared no effort to further the academic careers of former doctoral students, including honest and forthright criticism. There was a certain mistrust about the utility of studying the history of women in the Middle Ages, a field that was becoming prominent in America in his later life²⁰. More long-standing was his dislike of medieval Christian piety or even the history of the church, fields that he grudgingly admitted had some importance, but which students would be better advised to undertake with someone else²¹.

In large measure the success enjoyed by Robert Lopez at Yale and in American and international academic life was a product of sheer intellectual acuity and productivity, his ability to reveal the dynamic expansion of medieval economic life. He was utterly and selflessly devoted to work with few outside interests in such things as sport²². Lopez was not much moved by the world's luxuries. He enjoyed his status as a leading medievalist and appreciated the many honors he received, but, anticlericalism notwithstanding, his character was more monastic than that of the academic mandarin. At the same time, he shows in his letters a compassionate and philosophical appreciation of human efforts and accomplishments as well as a witty but not cynical understanding of human vanity.

It would be tedious, and of course there is not sufficient time, to run through even a small portion of the approximately 135 articles and dozen books that comprise the publications of Robert Lopez. To appreciate his work one could divide this corpus into particular themes, such as those devoted to Genoa, or the Byzantine Empire, or urban history, or commerce²³. I should like rather to examine the idea of the significance of the Middle Ages for Lopez, especially as revealed by the two books for which he is perhaps best remembered: *The Birth of Europe*, first published in French in 1962, and *The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages* which first appeared in the United States in 1971²⁴. The first is in the nature of a survey of the social history of medieval Europe, part of a series of books undertaken under the direction of Fernand Braudel intended to show the connections and contexts of

¹⁹ YUA, Lopez Papers, Letter to Prof. Edward Peters of the University of Pennsylvania, dated 6 December 1975.

²⁰ YUA, Lopez papers, letter to Helen Berger (undated, 1979?).

²¹ Robert Somerville, a scholar of medieval canon law and the history of the papacy who received his Ph.D. from Yale and teaches at Columbia, has given me his recollections of this.

²² With the exception of mountain-climbing in the Alps, at which he was quite expert. He loved both the euphoria of the altitude and the feeling, as he remarked to his wife, of competing only against himself.

²³ This is the approach taken by Donald E. Riggs in the introduction to a pamphlet catalogue of the Robert S. Lopez Collection at Arizona State University where books and offprints belonging to Lopez currently reside.

²⁴ R. Lopez, *The Birth of Europe* (as above, note 6); R. Lopez, *The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages, 950-1350* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1971).

European history within a wider world, and also to offer an account oriented around society and material culture rather than political or military events. *The Birth of Europe* treats the approximately thousand years from the crisis of the late Roman Empire to the economic decline following the Black Death²⁵. Although Lopez did not quite share the philosophical and somewhat ponderous historiographic style of the *Annales* school which favored geographic, environmental and even geologic detail, the opportunity to write history focused on Europe's definition and expansion was congenial and Lopez welcomed the invitation of Lucien Febvre in 1952 to write a book tentatively entitled 'Débuts de l'Europe: premiers succès'. For this rather bland title Lopez eventually substituted the more dynamic "Naissance de l'Europe", reflecting a notion derived from Pirenne of the transformation of the classical world towards modern European civilization, but (unlike Pirenne) a Europe in which the Mediterranean had not lost any of its intense economic life with the rise of France, Germany or England.

The book, which Lopez felt would be his "chef-d'oeuvre", took ten years from the time of Febvre's invitation until its publication. The correspondence with Braudel shows Lopez' worry and distress over his delays and the difficulty he had in balancing the competing necessities for detail, clarity and completeness. With the book seemingly near completion, he still faced with obstacles in letting it go. With comical but nonetheless real anxiety, Lopez expressed to Braudel his fear of the shadow of Pirenne and a sense of the inadequacy of his efforts²⁶. In the event, the book in its lucidity and energy shows no evidence of the agonies of its composition.

The second book is also a survey but more in the nature of a synthesis of much of Lopez' previous work on how the medieval economy worked and what attitudes, practices and opportunities fueled its expansion. It does not neglect the agricultural basis for this expansion and this differentiates Lopez from an earlier generation of economic and urban historians for whom agriculture was a world from which merchant enterprise had to release itself.

The notion of a commercial revolution has been internalized by historians in the intervening decades, so that, for example, a recent book of articles on northern maritime trade in bulk commodities is described in advertisements as offering a view that questions the existence of such a "commercial revolution"²⁷. The nature of this revolution, according to Lopez, was more than a readjustment of economic forces in the direction of growth rather than stagnation, but rather the creation of a completely new economy and also of new ideas of economic activity. Perhaps more lasting in its implications than the now widely-accepted idea of a commercial revolution is what Lopez described as the practices and outlook of medieval merchants and how they developed ways of dealing with risk, exchange, profit, investment, and family. Lopez may, as I've said, have represented the material-culture side of the *Annales* school more than its *mentalités* side, but many of his most intriguing

²⁵ The background to this project is presented in Guido Lopez and Catia Cominetti, 'Nascita di *Naissance de l'Europe*: Il carteggio Roberto Lopez, Fernand Braudel, Annie Elissabide', *Quaderni medievali*, 44 (1997), 55-106. Elissabide worked for the publisher, A. Colin, and Lopez' lively and not always happy dealings with her over illustrations and the timetable for completion is excerpted here.

²⁶ 'Nascita di *Naissance de l'Europe*: Il carteggio Roberto Lopez, Fernand Braudel, Annie Elissabide', p. 91 (letter no. 15).

²⁷ *Cogs, Cargoes, and Commerce: Maritime Bulk Trade in Northern Europe, 1150-1400*, ed. by Lars Berggren et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003). Advertised in Brepols Publishers' newsletter for January 2003.

writings deal with merchants' attitudes, not simply the creation of capitalism or its pre-conditions (a subject too vaguely grandiose for his tastes) but the flexibility, persistence, and adaptability of medieval entrepreneurs. The "open horizons" of the merchants and their indefatigable travels combined, in a way that appealed to Lopez, curiosity and commercial acuity and represented the opposite of what the European Middle Ages was still erroneously taken to be, a supposedly rigorously dogmatic, intolerant and closed system.

Both these works, *The Birth of Europe* and *The Commercial Revolution* leave no doubt about the author's opinion that from 900 to 1350 Europe experienced an astonishing sustained economic expansion. For Lopez the accomplishments of the Middle Ages were not the old clichés of an "age of faith" or even the popular English and American notions of the medieval origins of state and parliamentary institutions. This era created modern Europe and the secular world we know. None of this may now seem very revolutionary. The growth of population and economy from 900 to the eve of the Black Death is so widely accepted that it's easy to forget the dominant role once played in the historical imagination by the Italian Renaissance. One of the major concerns of a very diverse group of historians of Lopez' generation was to dethrone the image of the Renaissance as the founding age of modern Europe and of modern secular ideas. The notion of the "dark ages" intervening between classical antiquity and the Renaissance has lingered in the popular mind as has the Weber-Tawney idea that capitalism could not come into being until the Reformation broke the ideological control of the Church and its antipathy to such practices as lending at interest. Lopez disliked the way in which the very name "Middle Ages" implied that the periods before and after were more important; that the era represented a decline from the classical world or at best a prolegomena to some desirable modernity²⁸. I won't waste time in proving the obvious falsity of these fixed ideas, but rather suggest some ways in which medievalists such as Lopez combated them.

One approach was to posit the existence of other "renaissances" before the Quattrocento. Charles Homer Haskins' *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* which appeared in 1927 was the first American work of medieval history to have a lasting international influence and this term, the "twelfth-century Renaissance" is still common in teaching and in turn gave rise to a number of other expressions of the survival and revival of the classical tradition, notably the "Carolingian Renaissance" and the "Ottonian Renaissance". Lopez published 'The Tenth Century: Still Another Renaissance?' in the prominent *American Historical Review* in 1951, a study and argument that exalted his beloved pioneer century of Italian commerce as a Renaissance not in terms of a revival of learning or a blend of Christian and classical culture, but as a rebirth of Mediterranean commercial activity, the foundation of what he was to call later the "success story" of the Middle Ages²⁹.

²⁸ Zerbi, 'Il medioevo emisferico' (as above, note 1), pp. 206, 209.

²⁹ 'The Tenth Century: Still Another Renaissance?', *American Historical Review*, 57 (1951), 1-21; 'The Middle Ages: A Success Story', *Ventures* (a publication of the Graduate School of Yale University), 5, no. 2 (1965), 6-10. Concerning Lopez and the periodization of the centuries conventionally included in the "Middle Ages", see Romagnoli, 'Il Medioevo' (as above, note 1), pp. 48-62. On the identification of multiple renaissances, see Warren Treadgold, *Renaissances before the Renaissance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984).

Lopez was, as I said, not the only historian of his era to emphasize this progressive view of the Middle Ages as a period of growth and efflorescence. R.W. Southern's *The Making of the Middle Ages* (1953) or Joseph Strayer's *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State* (1970) saw various medieval centuries as crucial in the creation of the modern outlook and institutions. This tendency was further developed in works that emphasized the medieval "discovery of the individual", or the pre-colonial or proto-colonial expansion of Europe such as Colin Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual* (1972); Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe* (1995), or R.I. Moore, *The First European Revolution* (2000). These terms "birth", "making", "revolution" demonstrate a common estimation of the dynamic qualities of the medieval period. Few other historians were quite as openly contemptuous of the Italian Renaissance as Lopez, who saw that vaunted era as economically depressed and even its art as an expression of unproductive investment³⁰. But in all these works, Lopez regarded the peculiar cultural and political power of modern Europe, for better or worse, as the product of the medieval centuries. Moreover, this accomplishment goes beyond merely restoring in the form of a "renaissance" the legacy of the Roman world. While the other writers have been content generally to emphasize the ability to go beyond classical knowledge while assimilating it (Southern), or simply emphasize the newness of medieval institutions (Moore, Bartlett, Strayer), Lopez in exploring the economic revolution that began in the tenth century demonstrated by how much medieval and in particular Italian merchants surpassed their classical predecessors. The Romans had an immense and well-organized empire, but it was in the medieval Italian cities that public debt financing, insurance, and modern forms of bookkeeping and commercial contracts were invented³¹. The commercial revolution for Lopez was more than merely the start of a period of economic growth, but also the birth of Europe in the sense of the creation of the modern economy and its fundamental practices and assumptions.

The two books thus share the idea of the medieval origins of Europe and of the modern world. This progressive Middle Ages is essentially secular and little interest or credit is given to Christianity. Only a modest place is accorded to the classical inheritance. Lopez, unlike Strayer, was not impressed by the fief or feudalism as a key to understanding medieval society, nor did he share Strayer's exalted view of either the medieval or modern state.

Despite an optimistic, even triumphalist presentation of the medieval period, Lopez was more interested in the Middle Ages in its own terms and accomplishments than as the origin of modern institutions or attitudes. He was not so interested in the modern world as to subordinate the unique qualities of the medieval period to a teleological view of history in which the past is important only insofar as it anticipates the contemporary world. Thus the Middle Ages is not so much the

³⁰ (With Harry Miskimin) 'The Economic Depression of the Renaissance', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, 14 (1962), 408-26; 'Hard Times and Investment in Culture', in *Symposium on the Renaissance* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1953), pp. 19-34, reprinted in *The Renaissance: Medieval or Modern?*, ed. by Karl H. Dannenfeldt (Boston: Heath, 1959), pp. 50-63 and in *Social and Economic Foundations of the Italian Renaissance*, ed. by Anthony Molho (New York: Wiley, 1969), pp. 95-116. These articles created great controversy. Judith Brown, 'Prosperity or Hard Times in Renaissance Italy', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 42 (1989), 761-80, looks at these arguments from a certain distance.

³¹ In addition to *The Commercial Revolution*, the article 'The Dawn of Medieval Banking,' in *The Dawn of Modern Banking* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), pp. 1-23 describes these financial innovations.

moment of the birth of capitalism, or individualism or the modern state. It is regarded as a dynamic, progressive period but seen in light of the experience of medieval people who of course did not see themselves refracted in terms of an unknown future. This quality of immediacy and of respect for the period in its own right means that the work Lopez undertook on the economic revolution reads better now than most other books of the 1960s and 1970s that emphasized medieval progress. This is all the more notable because the field of medieval economic history itself has not flourished in the years since Lopez died.

Discussing the legacy and influence of Robert Lopez we come up against the puzzling but indisputable fact of a decline in research on the economic and urban history of the Middle Ages by American medievalists in the last twenty years. Of Lopez' books in English, only the collection of medieval commercial documents edited with Irving Raymond is still in print³². To some extent this neglect is an American accentuation of international trends in scholarship: 1) the rise in the 1960s and 1970s and subsequent fall of quantitative history (the use of statistics and computerized data bases to examine social history). 2) the success of one of the *Annales* school's innovation over the other: the continued vogue for the history of mentalities as opposed to that of material culture. The first of these is less important, because the brief vogue for quantification and its subsequent eclipse has not everywhere discouraged economic history. In addition, Lopez himself was not especially adept at or interested in mathematical concepts or manipulation. In an article entitled 'Agenda for Medieval Studies' in the 1971 *Journal of Economic History*, Lopez recalled a fruitless effort at the beginning of his career to calculate Genoa's gross national product for the year 1253. He concluded that "cliometrics" (the application of econometric techniques to history) and medieval economic history would never be friends³³. Lopez distinguished his own approach from the mathematical modeling of historical economists whose abstractions and implausible reductionism were responsible for what Lopez already in 1961 perceived as a decline in his chosen field of economic history³⁴.

Among Lopez' students was David Herlihy, who died in 1991, the most prominent advocate of statistical analysis of large quantities of information to evaluate social (and to some extent economic) historical questions such as urban demography, the economic status of women, and patterns of landholding³⁵. Although Herlihy received great attention and acclaim for this work, neither Lopez nor, as it turned out, very many other medievalists, ever adapted quantitative methodologies.

Students of Robert Lopez have carried on many aspects of his work. Kathryn Reyerson has advanced both urban and commercial history in her studies of

³² *Medieval Trade in the Mediterranean World: Illustrative Documents* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955, reprinted 2001).

³³ 'Agenda for Medieval Studies', *Journal of Economic History*, 31 (1971), 165-71.

³⁴ YUA, Lopez papers, correspondence with William Parker especially during 1961.

³⁵ David Herlihy, *Opera muliebria: Women and Work in Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990); *Medieval and Renaissance Pistoia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967); *The Social History of Italy and Western Europe, 700-1500* (articles), (London: Variorum, 1978); with Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *Tuscans and their Families: A Study of the Florentine Catasto of 1427* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, originally published in French in 1978).

medieval Montpellier³⁶. Stuart Jenks wrote an exhaustive history of late medieval trade between England and the North Sea and Baltic regions, but his teaching and research career has been in Germany³⁷. Susan Mosher Stuard, who also studied with Lopez, wrote on medieval Ragusa (Dubrovnik) and on aspects of Mediterranean commerce but, ironically given Lopez' opinions, proved to be best known as a pioneer of the history of women in the Middle Ages³⁸. There has been some attention given to English towns and commerce, notably by Maryanne Kowaleski, but the field of English history in general has also suffered from a surprising degree of neglect in America³⁹.

As exemplified by the work of our host and organizer Santiago Aurell, the investigation of the medieval merchant continues to produce remarkable work in Spain and in Europe generally. Indeed because there is always a considerable amount of attention devoted to the history of a scholar's nation, region or town, European medievalists can hardly cease to be concerned with trade, urban development, and economic activities, especially if they study areas such as Italy or the Hanseatic towns or other regions of intense urbanization and commerce. American medievalists, who are for better or worse less able or inclined to identify one particular geographical area of research, have turned away from social history altogether, especially the history of towns and trade. A look at the annual programs of the large interdisciplinary medievalists' meeting in Kalamazoo demonstrates this clearly. For every session that concerns urban or economic topics there are dozens that treat female piety, representation, ideology. In 2003 there were some 625 "panels" at the International Congress in Kalamazoo, thus about 1,875 communications. There were five panels on medieval "towns, trade and society" organized by Professor Maryanne Kowaleski of Fordham University. One of these panels consists entirely of European scholars, two from Britain and one from France. Another has one American scholar and two from Britain. A third session is devoted to medieval townswomen as consumers. There is also a discussion of urban culture in the Mediterranean region and its place in medieval studies, a theme that would have been dear to Robert Lopez' heart, that includes his aforementioned student Kathryn Reyerson. But this is all on the subjects of commerce and cities. The very small presence of these subjects at Kalamazoo has been consistent over a long time.

As they are most pronounced in the United States, these developments or tendencies need not detain us all that long or influence us unduly in considering Robert Lopez and subsequent scholarship. Yet as most of his career was spent in the United States and he trained many very accomplished students, it is at least worth

³⁶ Kathryn Reyerson, *Business, Banking and Finance in Medieval Montpellier* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1985); *Art of the Deal: Intermediaries of Trade in Medieval Montpellier* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); articles collected in *Society, Law and Trade in Medieval Montpellier* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1985).

³⁷ Stuart Jenks, *England, die Hansa und Preussen: Handel und Diplomatie, 1377-1474*, 3 vols. (Cologne: Böhlau, 1992).

³⁸ Susan Mosher Stuard, *State of Deference: Ragusa/Dubrovnik in the Medieval Centuries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992). Stuard edited *Women in Medieval Society* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976), and *Women in Medieval History and Historiography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).

³⁹ Maryanne Kowaleski, *Local Markets and Regional Trade in Medieval Exeter* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

noting the imbalance of the current state of affairs in our field. There may be some promising signs of a revival of interest in economic questions treated not on the basis of what remain dubious methods of quantifying often incommensurate data but on a deep and new look at sources, the recent book *Origins of the European Economy* by Michael McCormick is remarkable in this regard⁴⁰. Here is yet another example of the tendency to see the origins of modern Europe in the medieval period. This massive volume revisits the question of Mediterranean trade in the “Dark Ages” not by pawing over the few scattered references to commerce, but examining every known voyage across the Mediterranean, by ambassadors, churchmen, military representatives, which offer indirect but, as it turns out, copious and convincing evidence for a flourishing and varied series of exchanges including trade over the entire period covered. It breaks decisively with many of the remaining truisms derived from the Pirenne Thesis, from the supposed decline of commerce in the Carolingian era to the balance of trade that was thought to have drained gold out of the West (in fact, because of an extensive and extremely lucrative slave trade, the West had a trade surplus).

It is hard to tell what Lopez would have thought of McCormick’s work. It ends with 900, just the point at which Lopez became most interested in the history of commerce. Lopez eventually lost interest in the Pirenne Thesis altogether. From having started as what McCormick calls a “maximalist” (i.e. a believer in an extensive Carolingian commerce), Lopez came to regard the whole question of the volume of trade in the eighth and ninth century as unanswerable due to the scanty evidence⁴¹. McCormick makes extensive use of recent advances in archaeology and numismatics but he also, by the way in which he executes his ambitious project, uses sources that Lopez was not especially enthusiastic about (pilgrimage accounts, hagiography)⁴². Yet Lopez would have admired the exhaustive and eclectic use of new evidence and would certainly have approved of the emphasis on the Mediterranean as the arena of commerce and the attention given to the nascent Italian towns.

Perhaps what I have just asserted by way of conclusion is too pessimistic. There is new work on medieval economic and business history coming out from primarily English but also a few American scholars⁴³. An innovative exploration of the connections between medieval scientific and economic thought was published in 2000

⁴⁰ McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy* (as above, note 16).

⁴¹ In Lopez’ contribution to the second edition of the “Trade and Industry in the Middle Ages”, in *Cambridge Economic History of Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), II, p. 309.

⁴² Although Lopez’ antipathy to medieval church history did not mean he refused to acknowledge the importance of information derived from such sources as the accounts of the discovery and transport of relics. He was very enthusiastic about the work of one of his student Patrick Geary (now at the University of California, Los Angeles) whose doctoral thesis concerned pious stories of the theft of saints’ relics rescued from infidel lands or just neglect, published as *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).

⁴³ Diana Wood, *Medieval Economic Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Edwin S. Hunt and James M. Murray, *History of Business in Medieval Europe, 1200-1550* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Peter Spufford, *Power and Profit: The Merchant in Medieval Europe* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2003).

by Joel Kaye and it won a book prize from the Medieval Academy of America⁴⁴. It is perhaps not too much to hope that we may in the next years see a “renaissance” in American interest in the medieval merchants and towns, a field of research that owes so much to the energy of Robert Lopez, a field that is due for renewed study. The Italian and Mediterranean archives in general remain daunting but rich sources for the economic growth of the medieval period was accomplished.

Chronology

- 1910. Born in Genoa
- 1932. Doctorate in Letters, University of Milan
- 1933. Publication of his thesis, *Genova marinera nel Duecento: Benedetto Zaccaria, ammiraglio e mercante*.
- 1935. Appointment to the University of Genoa
- 1939. Emigration to Britain and then to the United States
- 1942. Doctorate in History from the University of Wisconsin
- 1943. Marriage to Claude-Anne Kirschen
- 1942-1945. Service with the Office of War Information and the Columbia Broadcasting Service
- 1946. Appointment to Yale University
- 1962. Publication of *La naissance de l'Europe*
- 1970. Appointment as Sterling Professor at Yale
- 1971. Publication of *The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages*
- 1985. Death in New Haven

Selected bibliography

1. Books

- Genova marinara nel Ducento: Benedetto Zaccaria, ammiraglio e mercante* (Messina and Milano: Principato, 1933; repr. Florence: Camunia, 1996).
- Studi sull'economia genovese nel Medio Evo* (Torino: S. Lattes, 1936).
- Storia delle colonie genovesi nel Mediterraneo* (Bologna: Nicola Zanchelli, 1938; repr. Genoa: Marietti, 1996).
- Medieval Trade in the Mediterranean World* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955; repr. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), (co-edited with Irving W. Raymond).
- La prima crisi della banca in Genova, secolo XIII* (Milano: Università Bocconi, 1956).
- The Tenth Century: How Dark the Dark Ages?*, ed. (New York: Rinehart, 1959).
- Naissance de l'Europe* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1962). Many translations in subsequent years.
- The Three Ages of the Italian Renaissance* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970).
- The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages* (Engelwood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1971).
- Su e giù per la storia di Genova* (collection of articles), (Genoa: Università di Genova, 1975).
- Byzantium and the World Around It* (collection of articles), (London: Variorum, 1978).
- The Shape of Medieval Monetary History* (collection of articles), (London: Variorum, 1986).

⁴⁴ Joel Kaye, *Economy and Nature in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

2. Articles

- 'Il principio della guerra Veneto-Turca nel 1463', *Archivio Veneto* 15 (1934), 45-131.
- 'Aux origines du capitalisme génoise', *Annales d'Histoire Economique et Sociale*, 9 (1937), 429-54.
- 'Byzantine Law in the Seventh Century and its Reception by the German and the Arabs', *Byzantion*, 16 (1942-1943), 445-61.
- 'Mohammed and Charlemagne: A Revision', *Speculum*, 18 (1943), 14-38.
- 'Du marché temporaire à la colonie permanente: la politique commerciale au Moyen Age', *Annales: E.S.C.*, 4 (1949), 389-405.
- 'The Dollar of the Middle Ages', *Journal of Economic History*, 11 (1951), 209-34.
- 'The Tenth Century: Still Another Renaissance?', *American Historical Review*, 17 (1951), 1-21.
- 'Hard Times and Investment in Culture', in *Symposium on the Renaissance* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1953), pp. 19-34.
- 'The Role of Trade in the Economic Readjustment of Byzantium in the Seventh Century', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 13 (1959), 69-85.
- 'The Economic Depression of the Renaissance', *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 14 (1962), 408-26 (with Harry Miskimin).
- 'Market Expansion: The Case of Genoa', *Journal of Economic History*, 24 (1964), 445-64.
- 'L'importanza del mondo islamico nella vita economica europea', *Settimane di studio CISMA*, 12 (1964), pp. 433-60.
- 'England to Egypt - 1350-1500: Long-Term Trends and Long Distance Trade', in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 93-128 (with Harry Miskimin and Avram Udovitch).
- 'Un texte inédit: le plus ancien manuel italien de technique commerciale', *Revue historique*, 493 (January-March, 1970), 67-76.
- 'Agenda for Medieval Studies', *Journal of Economic History*, 31 (1971), 165-71.
- 'Nouveaux documents sur les marchands italiens en Chine à l'époque mongole', *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1977), pp. 445-57.
- 'The Dawn of Medieval Banking', in *The Dawn of Modern Banking* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), pp. 1-23.
- 'Il più antico manuale italiano di pratica della mercatura', in *Atti della III Settimana di Studi dell'Istituto F. Datini* (Prato: 1981), pp. 461-469.

3. Publications about Robert S. Lopez

- Piero Zerbi, 'El Medioevo emisferico: Roberto S. Lopez', in Piero Zerbi, *Il medioevo nella storiografia degli ultimi vent'anni* (Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1985), pp. 205-301.
- Franco Cardini and Giosué Musca, 'Ricordo di Roberto Sabatino Lopez', *Quaderni medievali*, 22 (Dec. 1986), 5-20.
- Jacques Le Goff, 'Commemorazione di Roberto Sabatino Lopez', in *Storia e storie della città*, ed. by Daniela Romagnoli (Parma: Pratiche, 1988), pp. 37-41.
- Il medioevo degli orizzonti aperti, Atti della giornata di studio per Roberto S. Lopez*, ed. by Gabriella Airal di (Genova: Comune di Genova, 1989).
- Antonio Varsori, *Roberto Lopez: l'impegno politico e civile (1938-1945)* (Firenze: Università degli Studi di Firenze, 1990).
- Daniela Romagnoli, 'Il medioevo: uno stato d'animo? Riflessioni sull'opera di Roberto Sabatino Lopez', in *Il mestiere dello storico del medioevo: Atti del convegno di studi della Associazione dei Frati, Lugano, 17-19 maggio 1990*, ed. by Francesco Santi (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1992), pp. 39-71.

Georges Duby (1919 – 1996)

José Enrique RUIZ-DOMÈNEC
(Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

C'est avec un grand sens de la responsabilité que je reconnais ici, devant vous tous, rapporteurs et participants au colloque *Medievalistas del siglo XX*, la dette contractée envers Georges Duby, qui, sans l'avoir cherché, m'a stimulé dans la recherche d'un nouveau territoire de la connaissance historique, dont certains de mes livres sont un fruit tardif. En 1979, il m'invita – alors que j'étais un jeune professeur adjoint d'une université de province – à tenir une conférence au Collège de France, où il était un des promoteurs de la rénovation épistémologique française, avec Claude Lévi-Strauss, Georges Dumézil, Michel Foucault, Paul Veyne, Jean Delumeau, et d'autres professeurs de cette institution; là, il me raconta, avec des paroles que je n'ai jamais pu oublier, que, pour les médiévistes, l'histoire de la culture était une question sans aucun intérêt. Depuis, j'ai voulu montrer les liens profonds que l'Histoire entretient avec la Philosophie, cela dans un esprit semblable à celui de R. G. Collingwood, dont l'*Autobiographie* a constitué un de mes livres de chevet, en particulier dans les instants de doute, toujours nombreux.

J'ai conservé cette remarque de Duby année après année, pendant toute une décennie, celle des années quatre-vingts, où mes recherches portaient sur les aspects culturels (et idéologiques) sous-jacents aux changements sociaux. Une ligne de travail, celle-ci, que j'ai exposée dans mes livres *El origen de la obra de arte feudal* (1979); *El juego del amor como re-presentación del mundo en Andrés el Capellán* (1980); *La caballería o la imagen cortesana del mundo* (1981-1983); *La memoria de los feudales* (1984), qui a eu un prologue de Duby lui-même; *La mujer que mira* (1986); *Siete mujeres para Tirant* (1987); *Boucicaud, gobernador de Génova. Biografía de un caballero errante* (1988); y *La novela y el espíritu de la caballería* (1993). Ces œuvres, écrites entre 1979-1991, étendent aux domaines de la pensée l'analyse de l'imaginaire social vers lequel m'avait conduit l'analyse de Georges Duby sur la théorie politique du Moyen Âge.

Pour résumer les sujets principaux de cette recherche, je citerai quelques mots de Duby insérés dans son article "L'histoire des systèmes de valeurs", publié dans la revue *History and Theory* (1972), qui depuis l'année de son premier numéro, en 1961, était considérée le lieu approprié pour exposer un programme de travail à caractère international. Dans ses pages, Isaiah Berlin avait plaidé pour le retour au caractère artisanal de l'histoire, une idée que Duby répétait instamment dans ses interviews journalistiques en affirmant qu'il était le parfait exemple d'historien artisan. J'ai toujours pensé que cette affirmation, comme beaucoup d'autres qu'il faisait généralement, faisait au fond partie de la rhétorique de la dissimulation qu'il aimait souvent pratiquer. Dans *History and Theory*, Duby a écrit ce qui suit:

«L'histoire globale d'une civilisation résulte de changements qui se produisent à différents étages, au niveau de l'écologie, de la démographie, des techniques de production et des mécanismes d'échange, au niveau de la répartition des pouvoirs et de la situation des organes de décision, au niveau enfin des attitudes mentales,

des comportements collectifs, et de la vision du monde qui gouverne ces attitudes et régit ces comportements. Des corrélations étroites unissent ces divers mouvements, mais chacun d'eux se poursuit, de manière relativement autonome : selon des rythmes particuliers. On peut observer, à certains niveaux, à celui notamment des relations politiques, des modifications parfois très rapides. Mon expérience personnelle m'incite à penser que l'histoire des systèmes de valeurs ignore les mutations brusques».

Au moment où Duby a écrit ces mots il était un médiéviste réputé qui venait d'échapper de l'ostracisme universitaire d'une université de province française, l'Université d'Aix-en-Provence, où il s'était consacré à l'étude de l'économie rurale et de la vie paysanne dans une ligne proche à celle de son mentor universitaire et directeur de thèse Charles E. Perrin et, en partie, bien que plus éloigné, de celle de Marc Bloch dans *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*. Voyons brièvement ces débuts.

En 1952, il a soutenu sa thèse à la Sorbonne. C'était un travail académique, sans fissures, duquel il s'est toujours senti fier. Duby croyait à la discipline et conseillait de bien se tenir à ses égards, bien qu'il ait eu ses détracteurs comme Louis Halphen, "le vieux dragon grincheux", comme il l'a défini parfois. La thèse a donné lieu à l'important livre dont le titre, *La société aux XI^e et XII^e siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (1953), montre clairement ses objectifs, tellement proches des thèses de Marc Bloch qu'il avait adopté alors comme son véritable maître et mentor. Il s'agissait de suivre l'implantation du système féodal dans une région du nord-est de la France exceptionnellement riche en documents grâce à l'existence de grands centres monastiques. Le cadre social de l'aristocratie et l'exploitation du sol dominant sur les aspects purement économiques. Une étude de longue durée, mais aussi un modèle régional fondé sur la seule vérité possible pour l'historien : la vérité des documents. En dépit de son caractère austère, la thèse a la force explosive qu'en d'autres temps ont atteint les travaux de Marc Bloch ou de Lucien Febvre.

À l'automne 1954, Duby s'installe à Aix-en-Provence et commence à réfléchir à des projets. Il vient d'avoir trente-cinq ans. Ce fut un temps de grande intensité créative. Il cherche une maison entourée de montagnes et des mémoires de l'époque qu'il a décidé d'étudier, le Moyen Âge. Le bel endroit de Beaurecueil s'avère parfait : c'est là qu'il écrira tous ses livres. Duby cherche sa transformation. Il compte sur des aides. Pendant trois ans, il médite en profondeur sur le travail conçu comme une oeuvre, comme s'il s'agissait d'une cathédrale gothique. Ces méditations ont été reflétées dans un livre de débuts qui illustre toutefois la synthèse de sa pensée : *Histoire de la civilisation française* (1958), livre qu'il écrit avec la collaboration du moderniste Robert Mandrou. Ce sont les épreuves auxquelles il doit se soumettre. De 1954 à 1978, il revient à nouveau sur les mêmes problématiques en les affinant, parce que son âme d'artiste cherche la manière parfaite pour exécuter son oeuvre (une espèce de cathédrale intérieure).

D'abord, il élabore un plan. Ses recherches sur l'agriculture médiévale l'ont conduit à publier le livre *L'économie rurale et la vie campagnarde dans l'Occident médiéval* (1962), où il affirme que le travail des paysans sur une terre hostile a rendu possible la culture européenne. Grâce à ce livre, Georges Duby connaît une réputation internationale et devient un des spécialistes de l'histoire agricole. Les comptes rendus ont été fort nombreux et tous particulièrement élogieux, y compris ceux des grands professeurs comme Postan, Abel ou Slicher Van Bath.

Le second moment de son oeuvre (une sorte de façade de cette cathédrale intérieure) est consacré à l'étude de la période initiale de l'économie européenne. A cet égard, l'invitation que Carlo Cipolla lui fit en 1970 pour qu'il prenne part à *The Fontana Economic History of Europe* fut décisive. Le texte de cette oeuvre a été par la suite étendu et corrigé en rédigeant un des volumes de l'histoire économique de Charles Wilson : un texte que Gallimard publiera en français sous le titre de *Guerriers et Paysans* (1973). L'interprétation proposée par Duby de l'économie européenne du siècle VIIe au XIIe siècle s'est avérée imposante. Il a lu quelques comportements sociaux comme alors le faisaient généralement les anthropologues, en montrant l'intérêt de cette démarche pour les historiens, démarche jusqu'alors peu appréciée. Celle de Duby fut une interprétation révolutionnaire, où le pillage et les conduites du cadeau deviennent les élans authentiques de la croissance économique à l'époque carolingienne. Il a également étudié l'apparition de la seigneurie banale, comme le cadre fondamental de la civilisation européenne. C'était comme s'il vivait les actions des guerriers de l'an mil, ce moment de l'histoire européenne qui tant l'attirait. Le conflit dans la société du XIe siècle était centré sur les bénéfices de la production agricole, dans l'excédent, dit-il, en reprenant un concept d'Althusser, qu'il lisait alors avec attention, pour mieux comprendre l'histoire marxiste, il nourrissait un intérêt tout particulier.

Duby n'avait pas de doutes à ce propos. Marx lui a enseigné à mieux comprendre la formation de la seigneurie banale européenne. Grâce à lui, il a pu parcourir les travaux de défrichage, la croissance démographique, l'irrigation et la canalisation de l'eau et, surtout, l'utilisation de la violence (la contrainte extra économique) pour favoriser la production agricole. Entre 1969 et 1973 (c'est-à-dire entre la version anglaise et la version française de ce livre) Duby a été considéré comme le médiéviste le plus complet de son temps. Ses collègues l'ont reconnu comme tel et par le bon accueil de *Guerriers et Paysans*, tous ont su évaluer, dans leur juste mesure, la lecture subtile de la guerre médiévale qu'il a fait dans *Le dimanche de Bouvines*, comme l'article admirable qu'il a publié pour la collection dirigée par Jacques Le Goff «Faire de l'Histoire».

Par ces travaux, il s'est inscrit avec fermeté dans le difficile univers de l'idéologie et de la production culturelle. Une réflexion qu'il ne mena point à l'Université d'Aix (fortement punie après les événements de mai '68) mais à Paris, au Collège de France. Le 4 décembre 1970, il prononça sa leçon inaugurale qui avait pour titre *Des sociétés médiévales* (1970) : il s'agit d'une réflexion synthétique mais brillante qui très tôt se transformerait en une relique recherchée. C'est peut-être pourquoi les responsables des «Annales» se sont pressés de la publier en voulant montrer, de cette façon, que Duby était un membre de l'équipe. Dans ce programme d'intentions, il souligne au premier plan ses approches sur l'idéologie et l'art médiéval. De cette manière son travail pour Albert Skira est devenu le centre de toute son oeuvre, comme les arcs-boutants dans une cathédrale gothique. C'était quelque chose qui a été compris immédiatement par Pierre Nora qui le publia chez Gallimard : *Temps de cathédrales* (1976). Duby a accepté le défi de son vieil ami Nora, même de bon gré, parce que, dans ces années, il était convaincu que le principe et la fin de toute recherche sur le Moyen Âge se trouvent dans l'explication de la naissance de l'oeuvre d'art. Mais contrairement à John Ruskin, son plus célèbre prédécesseur et dont il a pris le titre de l'oeuvre, il appréciait l'art parce qu'il lui rappelait le monde de la vie médiévale.

C'est pourquoi il a décidé d'interpréter le phénomène artistique dans son oeuvre plus personnelle et débattue: *Saint Bernard* (1976), résultat sans doute des longues conversations maintenues à Senanque depuis 1970, année de la fondation d'un cercle d'études médiévales. L'objectif de son livre est le suivant: au début du XII^e siècle une appréciation nouvelle et révolutionnaire s'est produite sur le travail agricole et l'oeuvre d'art. Ce phénomène le capturerait depuis nombreuses années, et il avait déjà étudié à fond ces deux aspects, mais il l'avait fait séparément. Il vérifiait maintenant comme les cisterciens ont su unir la transformation agricole et l'oeuvre d'art. Pourquoi et comment ont-ils fait? Le travail des exploitations agricoles cisterciennes s'achève dans un cérémonial de fête qui conduit à la construction de l'église, réceptacle de leurs soucis, de leurs rêves, refoulement de la nuit

Le paysage est une réponse de l'âme humaine: une idée qui rappelle Yi-Fu Tuan. Saint Bernard et ceux qui l'ont suivi voyaient la vie comme un chemin de perfection basé sur le travail agricole et sa transformation fériée qui donnait lieu à l'oeuvre d'art. Le temps de la vie s'est ainsi transformé en une action liturgique pour accepter l'ordre du cosmos, et non pour le rejeter comme le faisaient les clunisiens. Face à l'agressivité de l'art roman, on relève l'oeuvre d'art souriante, maternelle, du cistercien, qui, d'une certaine manière annonce le gothique. La rénovation du travail agricole et celle de l'oeuvre d'art sont deux manières de parler de la beauté. Quand Saint Bernard dit que telle ou telle chose doit être faite, il veut dire qu'il existe une raison esthétique qui légitime ses objectifs, donc il est le théoricien qui annonce une nouvelle époque au milieu d'une crise sans antécédents dans le monde médiéval.

Travailler sur la condition campagnarde et sur l'oeuvre d'art a enseigné à Duby à évaluer les relations entre la vie matérielle et l'idéologie. Un rapprochement au marxisme de son ami anglais le médiéviste Rodney Hilton l'a conduit à approfondir dans les contraintes extra économiques auxquelles étaient soumis les paysans, en donnant forme ainsi à un discours de ton marxiste qui a décidément influencé quelques médiévistes français de la génération suivante, comme Pierre Bonnassie. Mais Duby voulait aller plus loin. Il s'est interrogé sur le fondement idéologique du pouvoir de l'aristocratie féodale. Il l'a fait dans un article programme, publié dans «Faire de l'Histoire», un projet conçu par François Furet et Jacques Le Goff à la plus grande gloire de l'historiographie mondiale. L'écho de ses idées est arrivé loin. En 1970, Roberto Sabatino López, après une promenade à Barcelone, en commentant la situation du médiévisme international, m'a conseillé la lecture de cet article et de me mettre en contact avec Duby. J'ai mis à longtemps le faire, mais finalement, j'ai réussi.

En 1972, quand Duby a envoyé le texte à *History and Theory*, il avait déjà accepté la chaise du Collège de France, et il était prêt à présenter publiquement son programme de recherche. Jacques Le Goff l'a bien aidé dans ce métier, et dans beaucoup d'autres choses, notamment à le mettre en contact avec la difficile société parisienne et avec les secteurs les plus progressistes de l'équipe des *Annales*. La recherche choisie pour montrer au monde sa nouvelle responsabilité a été une longue, parfois dense, considération des textes qui ont formulé dans le Nord de la France la théorie des trois ordres. Le résultat final de ces classes a été un de ses livres les plus polémiques, *Les trois ordres ou l'imaginaire du féodalisme*, publié par la NRF en 1978, tout en donnant vie, de cette manière, à une relation étroite entre professeur et éditeur. Ce livre a été mille fois commenté, et mille fois mal compris. Ce n'est pas ici le lieu pour s'y attarder. Il suffit d'indiquer qu'une exégèse des

contenus et des cadres qui y sont exposés est une exigence dans l'étude du médiévisme du XXe siècle.

Pendant l'exercice biennal 1978-1979, années où j'ai le plus conversé avec Duby, un jeune et alors célèbre philosophe parisien, Guy Lardreau, enregistrait ses confessions avec un magnétophone posé sur sa table de travail qui donnèrent lieu aux célèbres *Dialogues* publiés dans la collection qu'Antoine Gallien dirigeait pour Flammarion: ce livre est un exposé détaillé de sa pensée, que le jeune philosophe lui a arraché. Il parle beaucoup du *métier* et de ce qui conduit les hommes à écrire sur l'Histoire, et le sens du professionnalisme: "Je ne suis pas un amateur, mais un professionnel". L'inquiétude se reflète dans son visage. Il était sans doute au moment culminant de sa carrière.

Pendant les sept années suivantes, Duby a conçu une nouvelle oeuvre. À cette occasion, il a cherché une réponse à deux questions fondamentales de la culture européenne du XIIe siècle: la chevalerie et l'amour courtois. Il a invité d'autres médiévistes à le suivre tant il était convaincu de l'efficacité de son travail qui ressemble à ce qu'un contrepoint est pour la musique c'est-à-dire la conjonction de deux ou plusieurs mélodies différentes dans une même oeuvre. Enregistrons soigneusement la contribution de ces années à la connaissance du Moyen Âge européen: ce n'est pas un simple stratagème comme généralement on le qualifie, mais c'est la manifestation d'une nouvelle navigation, la troisième, comme en son temps l'a fait Platon, et dans laquelle Duby avait déposé tous ses espoirs. S'était-il trompé? Je ne le crois pas. Quand il a présenté son projet dans la Zaharoff Lecture de 1982-83 avec le titre *Que sait-on de l'amour en France au XIIe siècle ?* il était convaincu d'avoir trouvé la méthode qui permettrait d'étudier la sensibilité du passé (ce rêve qui avait passionné Lucien Febvre et certains annalistes) ; et il la présentait avec la même passion intellectuelle qu'il avait nourri, quelques années auparavant, envers l'étude de l'idéologie en suivant les travaux d'Althusser.

De cette manière, il a fait connaître au monde l'image de la femme renversée par la violence masculine, réfugié dans les bras des confesseurs auxquels elle confiait ses secrets plus intimes. Les textes de ces confessions féminines lui ont servi pour placer l'amour comme une passion de l'homme, un élan irréfrenable qui, d'une certaine manière, interprétait comme une métaphore du pouvoir en communion avec les idées de Lacan, le bien aimé des jeunes parisiens de ces années. Avec le monde de la chevalerie, Duby faisait de même. Durant de nombreuses années, il s'était intéressé à Guillaume le Maréchal, dont un de ses hommes de confiance, probablement son écuyer, avait été chargé de raconter sa vie : nous sommes devant l'histoire d'un chevalier errant qui par ses mérites personnels est devenu comte de Pembroke et régent d'Angleterre pendant la minorité d'Henri III, grâce auquel Guillaume réussit à sauver le trône dans la décisive bataille de Lincoln, en 1215. Il était nécessaire de faire connaître cette histoire. Pendant un certain temps, Duby l'avait commenté dans un programme de radio, jusqu'au moment où, son promoteur, Jean Montalbetti, lui a demandé de l'écrire.

En le faisant, en 1984, dans son beau livre *Guillaume le Maréchal*, Duby a trouvé de nouveau la passion pour l'écriture de l'Histoire, qui lui a permis d'affronter la vie de ce personnage comme s'il s'agissait d'un roman historique (selon ce qu'il confesse au journaliste Antoine de Galdemar). C'est pourquoi, il s'est tant efforcé de montrer l'image de ce chevalier : là où Walter Scott avait inventé le passé dans son célèbre *Ivanhoe*, Duby analysait, au moyen d'anciens témoignages, les nuances

de la position de Scott avec des appréciations ingénieuses et ajoutait les informations qu'il avait obtenues des spécialistes anglais sur l'armement et l'art militaire. Sur *Guillaume le Maréchal*, les commentaires furent très divers. Maurice Keen et Arno Borst, les meilleurs spécialistes de la chevalerie médiévale, lui ont été favorables. Cependant les critiques l'ont affecté jusqu'au point d'écrire un prologue dans la version italienne où ils démontraient que son livre était parfaitement encadré dans la ligne de travail de l'école française. Les médiévistes qui ont critiqué cette oeuvre n'ont fait que placer la discipline dans une position à risque. Peu d'études ont été tellement bénéfiques pour la connaissance du passé comme ce livre, dont la rigidité ne se basait pas sur les notes à pied de page que Duby, volontairement, laissait de côté, mais dans le contexte de l'écriture elle-même, comme je crois l'avoir démontré dans l'édition espagnole.¹ La lecture de l'*Album* que j'ai effectué en l'honneur du maître, prouve tout le support érudit sur lequel reposait ce livre.

Force est de reconnaître que les critiques ont laissé une impression de tristesse chez Duby. Pendant des années, il m'a demandé de la sortie de nos études. Entre 1984 et 1987, notre relation s'est intensifiée, atteignant un certain degré d'intimité. Des nombreuses réunions et une correspondance touffue, nous ont permis de débattre sur les principes qui devaient régir notre discipline. Cette attitude a laissé une trace perdurable dans ma mémoire, c'est pourquoi je n'ai pas douté de le choisir comme un des vingt-et-un historiens qui formèrent l'histoire du siècle XXe dans mon livre *Rostros de la Historia* (2000).

Mais la confiance de Duby en ses propres idées n'était pas, toutefois, complètement solide. Quelque chose dû avoir lieu dans son esprit entre l'automne et l'hiver de 1986-1987. Un brusque virage s'est produit alors dans son travail intellectuel et dans son attitude face aux changements historiques. Il a perdu la sensibilité avec laquelle il avait affronté toute sa vie. Il a calculé de mauvaise façon les traces de l'historiographie future. Il a préféré suivre une ligne conservatrice avec un aspect progressiste. Il a dévié, en prenant la version moins correcte du XXe siècle. Cette perte dans le labyrinthe qu'exigent parfois les équilibres du pouvoir a affecté son travail personnel et son témoignage historiographique.

La plus grande rupture avec sa ligne de travail qu'unissait le *Saint Bernard* avec le *Guillaume le Maréchal* est arrivé avec le succès de la monumentale oeuvre, admirée par certains, *Storie delle Donne in Occidente* qu'il a co-dirigé (avec Michelle Perrot), pour les frères Laterza. Cet immense pamphlet sur le passé des femmes défendait à outrance une vision de l'histoire entre la déconstruction et le féminisme de barricade. La complexité de l'oeuvre, due en partie aux nombreux auteurs qui l'ont écrite, empêche un jugement pondéré. Mais l'implication de Duby lui-même dans ses approches restait claire, dans sa petite contribution au deuxième volume consacré au Moyen Âge, dirigé par Christine Klapisch-Zuber, avec le titre *Le modèle courtis.* Presque vingt pages de prose serrée visant à bloquer toute étude sérieuse sur le passé des femmes.

Pendant une grande partie de la décennie des années quatre-vingt-dix le sujet central du débat historiographique fut la portée de ce type de produits éditoriaux visant à plaire au public plus qu'à approfondir la connaissance du passé. Comment pouvons-nous offrir une explication rationnelle des processus historiques une fois

¹ Georges Duby, *Guillermo el Mariscal* (Madrid, Alianza, 1997).

que le darwinisme social, a succombé à sa propre imposture? La nouvelle génération des *Annales* a plaidé pour une histoire culturelle, au même moment que on la chute du mur de Berlin et la fin du colosse soviétique ont montré à tout le monde ce qu'il y avait derrière ce simulacre pervers où toute l'Europe centrale et orientale s'était transformée. Dans ces circonstances il était nécessaire une certaine sagesse pour mener le débat sur l'histoire vers un point moyen entre les relativistes à outrance et les historicistes. De cette manière, la foi sur les certitudes de l'historiographie de la seconde moitié du XXe siècle s'est assez décomposée.

Celle-ci est ma lecture de la situation à laquelle est arrivé Georges Duby durant les dernières années de sa vie intellectuelle, à partir de 1987 qu'on peut définir comme l'histoire d'une déviation qui toutefois ne m'empêche pas de le reconnaître comme l'un des plus sages historiens de tous les temps, surtout par sa tâche entre 1973-1984: douze années où il a représenté le rêve d'une rénovation en profondeur de l'étude du Moyen Âge, d'une renaissance de la conscience critique face aux différents topiques. Un rêve que je ne considère pas un "faux mouvement", comme le dirait Goethe, mais une mémoire touffue d'un moment particulièrement brillant d'un auteur et son monde qui nous a laissé une demi-douzaine de bons livres, sans lesquels l'histoire du XXe siècle resterait incomplète. Revenons sur eux pour apprendre, mais rentrons aussi sur les vicissitudes de son auteur qui a abandonné ses idées propres au bénéfice d'autres totalement étrangères et impropres pour celui qui avait écrit: «Mais il ne faut pas se dissimuler que ces relations s'enchevêtrent, que nulle méthode, ne permet encore d'aborder en sécurité un problème majeur, celui des interférences entre l'évolution des créations culturelles et celle de la société tout entière, et qu'il est par conséquent peut-être vain, en tout cas fort hasardeux de vouloir déceler les vrais rapports entre les structures d'ensemble d'une civilisation, les changements qui font insensiblement déplacer et déformer ces mêmes structures, et d'autre part un événement, multiple, diffus, largement épars dans le temps et l'espace: l'événement que constituent l'éclosion, l'épanouissement, puis l'étiollement de l'art cistercien»² Qu'est-ce que l'histoire pour moi? Pour trouver cette méthode l'œuvre et la personnalité du Georges Duby, que j'ai connu, ont été mes guides les plus fidèles.

Chronologie

1919. Il est né à Paris, le 7 octobre.

1932. A 13 ans s'installe avec sa famille à Mâcon.

1937. Il commence sa carrière dans la Faculté de Lettres de l'Université de Lyon.

1942. Agrégation à Grenoble. Début de sa thèse de doctorat sous la direction de Charles-E. Perrin.

1949. Il commence ses collaborations dans la revue *Annales*.

1952. Professeur d'histoire Médiévale de l'Université d'Aix-en-Provence.

1955. Il assiste au Congrès International des Sciences Historiques de Rome.

1958. Il fait amitié avec Albert Skira et commence la collaboration avec son éditorial à Genève.

² Georges Duby, *Saint Bernard. L'art Cistercien* (Paris: Flammarion, 1979), p. 15

1960. Codirecteur de la *Revue d'Etudes Rurales*.
 1962. Il publie *Economie Rurale et vie de campagne dans l'Occident Médiéval*
 1970. Professeur au Collège de France.
 1973. Prix 'Ambassadeur pour *Le dimanche de Bouvines*.
 1978. Il publie *Les trois ordres ou l'imaginaire du féodalisme*, résultat de ses leçons au Collège de France.
 1979-81. Séminaire sur la parenté et le monde féminin au Moyen Âge.
 1984. Il lit *Guillaume le Maréchal* dans le programme radiophonique «Les inconnus de l'Histoire». Il publie après un livre sur ce personnage.
 1985. Elu président de la Société d'Édition de Programmes de Télévision (SEPT)
 1987. Changement d'orientation de ses études. I dirige l'*Histoire des femmes*.
 1996 (3-XII) Il mort à 77 ans.

Bibliographie

1. Livres

- La société aux X et XI siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris: SEVPEN, 1953).
Recueil des pancartes de l'abbaye de la Ferté-sur-Grosne, 1113-1178 (Aix-en-Provence: 1953).
L'économie rurale et la vie de campagne dans l'occident médiéval (France, Angleterre, Empire, IX-XV siècles) (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1962)
Fondements d'un nouvel humanisme, 1320-1440 (Genève: Skira, 1966)
L'Europe des cathédrales 1140-1280 (Genève: Skira, 1966)
L'an mil (Paris: Juillard, 1967)
Leçon inaugurale au Collège de France (Paris: Gallimard 1972)
Adolescence de la Chrétienté occidentale, 980-1140 (Genève: Skira, 1967)
Le dimanche de Bouvines (Paris: Gallimard 1973)
Guerriers et Paysans (Paris: Gallimard, 1973)
Hommes et structures du moyen âge (Paris/La Haye: Mouton, 1973)
Les temps des cathédrales (Paris: Gallimard 1976)
Saint-Bernard et l'art cistercien (Paris: Flammarion, 1976)
Les trois ordres ou l'imaginaire du féodalisme (Paris: Gallimard 1978)
Medieval Marriage: two models from twelfth-century France (Baltimore: Johns Jopkins University Press, 1978)
L'Europe au moyen âge. Art roman, art gothique (Paris: Arts et métiers graphiques, 1979)
Le chevalier, la femme et le prêtre (Paris: Hachette, 1981)
Guillaume le Maréchal ou le meilleur chevalier du monde (Paris: Fayard, 1984)
L'Europe au moyen âge (Paris: flammarion, 1984)
Mâle Moyen Âge. De l'amour et autres essais (Paris: Flammarion, 1988)
L'histoire continue (Paris: Odile Jacob, 1991)
Dames du XII siècle. Héloïse, Aliénor, Iseut et quelques autres (Paris: Gallimard 1995)
Dames du XII siècle. Ses souvenirs des aïeules (Paris: Gallimard 1995)
Dames du XII siècle. Ève et prêtres (Paris: Gallimard 1995)
Féodalités (Paris: Gallimard 1996)

2. Articles

- 'Un essai d'interprétation des contrastes agraires en Bourgogne', *Études Rhodaniennes* (1945).
 'Economie domaniale et économie monétaire: le budget de l'abbaye de Cluny entre 1080 et 1155', *Annales ESC* (1952), 155-171.
 'Géographie ou chronologie du servage? Note sur les servi en Forez et en Mâconnais du IX-XV siècle, Hommage à Lucien Febvre, 1 (1953).

- 'Dangers s'une réussite', Saint Bernard, homme d'Eglise (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1953), pp. 67-75.
- 'Un inventaire des profits de la seigneurie clunisienne à la mort de Pierre le Vénérable', *Studia Anselmiana*, 40 (1956).
- 'La structure d'une grande seigneurie flamande la fin du XIII siècle', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Charles*, CXIV (1956), 183-186.
- 'Techniques et rendements agricoles dans les Alpes du sud en 1338', *Annales du midi* (1958)
- 'Notes sur les corvées dans les Alpes du Sud en 1338', *Etudes d'histoire du droit privé offerts Pierre Petot* (1959).
- 'Le grand domaine de la fin du Moyen Age en France', *Première conférence internationale d'histoire économique* (1960).
- 'La seigneurie et l'économie paysanne. Alpes du Sud 1338', *Etudes Rurales* (1961).
- 'Histoire des mentalités', dans *L'histoire et ses méthodes*, éd. par Charles Samaran (Paris: Gallimard 1961), pp. 937-966.
- 'Les jeunes dans la société aristocratique dans la France du Nord-ouest', *Annales ESC* (1964), 835-846.
- 'La vulgarisation des modèles culturels dans la société féodale', *Niveaux des cultures et groupes sociaux* (1967).
- 'Les origines de la chevalerie', *Ordinamenti militari in Occidente nell'alto medioevo* (1968).
- 'L'image du prince en France au XI siècle', *Cahiers d'histoire* (1972).
- 'Lignage, noblesse et chevalerie au XII siècle dans la région mâconnaise, une révision', *Annales ESC* (1972), 803-824.
- 'Histoire sociale et idéologies des sociétés', dans *Faire de l'histoire* éd. Par Jacques Le Goff et Pierre Nora, vol. I (Paris: Gallimard, 1974), pp. 147-168.
- 'Le plaisir de l'historien' dans Pierre Nora, *Essais d'ego histoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1987).

3. Œuvres collectives et sous sa direction

- Histoire de la Civilisation Française* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1959-1961) (avec Robert Mandrou).
- Histoire de la France*, éd. (Paris: Larousse, 1970).
- Histoire de la France rurale*, éd. (Paris: Seuil, 1975-1976) (avec Armand Wallon).
- Famille et Parenté dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris-Rome, 1978) (avec Jacques Le Goff).
- Atlas Historique Larousse*, éd. (Paris: Larousse, 1978).
- Histoire de la France urbaine*, éd. (Paris: Seuil, 1981).
- Histoire de la vie privée*, éd. (Paris: Seuil, 1985).
- La Méditerranée. Les hommes et l'héritage* (Paris: Flammarion, 1986) (avec Fernand Braudel).
- Histoire de Paris par la peinture*, éd. (Paris: Belfond, 1988).
- Atlas Historique. L'histoire du monde en 317 cartes*, éd. (Paris: Larousse, 1991).
- Histoire des femmes en occident*, éd. (Paris: Plon, 1991) (avec Michelle Perrot).

Jacques Le Goff (1924)

Jean-Claude SCHMITT
(EHESS – France)

Pour parler de Jacques le Goff – historien vivant, à l'inverse de la plupart de ceux dont est évoquée ici la mémoire – il m'est difficile de séparer l'oeuvre de la personne, sans doute en raison de nos relations intellectuelles et amicales, mais aussi parce que la présence chaleureuse et la générosité intellectuelle de Jacques le Goff transparaît à chaque instant dans tout son travail, sa parole, son écriture. A un ouvrage d'hommages récemment réunis par quelques uns de ses amis fut donné le titre emblématique *L'Ogre historien* (1998) : allusion à Marc Bloch parlant de la faim de « chair humaine » qui doit tenailler le bon historien, mais aussi justesse du portrait, tant est légendaire l'appétit intellectuel de Jacques Le Goff (presque autant que son vieux penchant pour les nourritures terrestres !). L'homme et l'historien sont donc intimement liés, comme le montrent du reste les divers essais d'« ego-histoire » où Jacques le Goff parle librement de lui : en 1987, dans les *Essais d'ego-histoire* réunis par Pierre Nora, en 1996 dans *Une vie pour l'histoire* (entretiens avec Marc Heurgon), en 2003 enfin, dans *A la recherche du Moyen Âge* (écrits en collaboration avec Jean-Maurice de Montrémy).

Jacques le Goff est né le 1^{er} janvier 1924 à Toulon, où il passa toute son enfance, avant d'étudier à Marseille puis à Paris. Enfant unique, il subit l'influence de son père, professeur de lycée aux fermes convictions agnostiques et laïques, mais qui est aussi d'une grande tolérance, et doit à sa mère, qui elle, est au contraire profondément catholique, et qui enseigne le piano, d'avoir acquis sa culture biblique et une grande sensibilité aux phénomènes religieux. Evoquant ses souvenirs d'enfance – il a rappelé plusieurs fois comment il découvrit le Moyen Âge à la lecture de Walter Scott – il n'a pas de mot trop dur pour Toulon, ville de militaires et fief de l'extrême droite. A la Méditerranée (même s'il adore l'Italie et connaît bien l'Espagne, mais il n'a jamais mis les pieds en Corse), il préférera toujours l'Atlantique et c'est en Bretagne – province d'origine de sa famille – qu'il s'enchant de revenir chaque été.

Elève de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, Jacques le Goff commence sa formation scientifique par des séjours à l'étranger : à Prague (où il assiste au « Coup de Prague » du 20 février 1948, une expérience qui le dissuade d'adhérer au Parti Communiste Français, à l'inverse de la plupart des jeunes intellectuels de sa génération), à Oxford en 1951-52 (il ne se départira plus jamais de l'opinion qu'il se fait alors sur la cuisine britannique !) et surtout en Italie (où il est pensionnaire de l'Ecole Française de Rome en 1952-53). Ces années de formation, favorisée également par deux détachements au CNRS (1953-54 et 1959-60), lui permettent de rédiger ses premiers articles (à partir de 1948) sur la vie universitaire et sur l'histoire du commerce du sel, mais surtout d'accumuler d'immenses lectures qui nourrissent les synthèses par lesquelles il va se faire très vite connaître.

Au début des années 50, alors que commence sa carrière scientifique, il appartient à la première génération des historiens de l'après-guerre ou, pour le dire

autrement, à la deuxième génération des héritiers des fondateurs des *Annales*, Marc Bloch et Lucien Febvre. Jacques le Goff n'a pas connu Marc Bloch, dont la vie et l'œuvre furent brutalement interrompues en 1944 et il n'a guère rencontré Lucien Febvre, qui mourra en 1956. L'homme fort de l'école historique française est alors Fernand Braudel, qui remarque Jacques le Goff dès 1950 et le fait entrer en 1960 à la VI^e Section de l'Ecole pratique des hautes études où il l'associe rapidement à la direction des *Annales*. Dès 1962, Jacques Le Goff est élu directeur d'études et en 1972 il succèdera à Fernand Braudel à la présidence de l'Ecole, dont il assurera en 1975 la transformation institutionnelle qui donnera naissance à l'École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.

On peut ici esquisser un parallèle entre Jacques le Goff et Georges Duby, qui était de cinq ans son aîné. Tous deux médiévistes, ils apparaissent bien comme les héritiers de Marc Bloch, mais différemment. L'un et l'autre se sont longuement interrogés, en écho à l'*Apologie pour l'histoire*, sur les principes et les méthodes du «métier d'historien». Mais comme en témoigne sa thèse sur le Mâconnais vu à travers les chartes de Cluny, Georges Duby s'est d'abord reconnu dans la *Société féodale*. D'emblée, Le Goff visa au contraire une histoire globale de la civilisation médiévale –dont l'étude pour Bloch venait s'ajouter à l'histoire sociale proprement dite– et c'est ainsi qu'il marquera sa préférence pour *Les rois thaumaturges*.

Jacques le Goff n'a jamais caché l'aversion que lui inspirait l'enseignement universitaire qu'il a connu durant ses études. Le pire, il le trouva chez le médiéviste Louis Halphen. Mais deux professeurs trouvèrent grâce à ses yeux : le spécialiste de l'Antiquité romaine William Seston (Jacques Le Goff ne manqua jamais de situer le Moyen Âge dans la continuité de l'Antiquité païenne et de l'Antiquité tardive) et le médiéviste Charles-Edmond Perrin, spécialiste du haut Moyen Âge. Un peu plus tard, de 1954 à 1959, Jacques Le Goff fut aussi l'assistant à l'Université de Lille de Michel Mollat dont il apprécia toujours la tolérance, l'ouverture d'esprit et l'aisance avec laquelle il sut établir des ponts entre l'histoire du commerce, l'histoire religieuse et celle de la pauvreté et des pauvres dans la société médiévale. Mais l'influence majeure que Jacques Le Goff a subie directement fut celle de son «maître» Maurice Lombard, disparu prématurément, historien du monde musulman médiéval et des vastes espaces eurasiatiques, dont – en compagnie de Bronislaw Geremek, l'ami polonais le plus cher – il suivit les séminaires de l'Ecole des hautes études de 1957 à 1960. Chez Lombard, chez Braudel, il trouva, dans l'espace comme dans le temps, ces perspectives vastes et longues qui l'amènèrent vite à faire un choix décisif, favorisé il est vrai par l'élection à l'EPHE : celui de ne pas se consacrer plus avant à sa thèse de doctorat d'Etat sur «les attitudes à l'égard du travail au Moyen Âge» (même si en fait il n'a jamais abandonné ce grand sujet et ne cessa d'y revenir de multiples façons dans ses livres et articles), mais de commencer par écrire des livres de synthèse lui permettant de proposer une nouvelle vision du Moyen Âge et une nouvelle conception de l'histoire.

Le premier livre parut en 1956 dans la petite collection «Que sais-je?» des Presses Universitaires de France : mais *Marchands et banquiers au Moyen Âge* était bien plus qu'un petit manuel pour étudiants ! Il tournait résolument le dos à l'histoire économique stricto sensu, pour faire place aux facteurs idéologiques, éthiques, identitaires qui animaient les marchands face à la morale ecclésiastique et au carcan des réglementations des échanges et du travail. Bien plus tard, *La bourse et la vie* (1986) –on y reviendra– reposera ces problèmes en intégrant à la réflexion la décou-

verte faite entre temps du rôle majeur du purgatoire dans l'imaginaire de la société médiévale.

Le deuxième livre, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge* (1957) était lui aussi destiné en principe à un public plus large que celui des spécialistes, et son succès ne s'est pas démenti depuis sa parution. Le titre illustre bien un aspect majeur de la réflexion de l'auteur, son usage heuristique de l'anachronisme: il détourne le sens commun de la notion d'«intellectuel», originellement liée en France à l'Affaire Dreyfus (1898), pour désigner les maîtres des écoles urbaines puis de l'Université qui, face aux deux pouvoirs traditionnels du roi (*regnum*) et de l'Eglise (*sacerdotium*) surent imposer à partir de la fin du XII^e siècle le pouvoir propre du *studium*. Ils étaient des «intellectuels» parce qu'ils vivaient de leur savoir – contre toute la tradition religieuse qui faisait du savoir un don gratuit de Dieu-, et préservaient leur indépendance grâce aux gages que leur versaient les étudiants. Loin de se cantonner dans l'histoire des idées ou des sciences, ce livre croise de manière beaucoup plus large tous les aspects de la vie universitaire et de l'insertion de l'université dans la société urbaine: aspects institutionnels (l'organisation des études), politiques (en évoquant par exemple l'impact de la grève de l'Université), techniques (avec de remarquables passages sur la fabrication et la diffusion du livre universitaire), mentaux (ainsi à propos d'Héloïse et Abélard, modèle achevé et malheureux du couple d'intellectuels).

Quelques années plus tard, en 1962, fort de sa nouvelle position à l'Ecole des hautes Etudes, Jacques Le Goff organise et introduit le colloque international «Hérésies et sociétés dans l'Europe préindustrielle, 11^e–18^e siècles» (1968). L'ouvrage, qui reste une référence obligée, se distingue par le souci de la «longue durée» qui rompt avec les cloisonnements chronologiques traditionnels et par la présence de plusieurs historiens d'Europe centrale et orientale (polonais, tchèques, russes) dont l'interprétation de l'hérésie en termes de classes et d'oppositions sociales est alors dominante. Jacques Le Goff y met (dans l'introduction comme dans les pages consacrées peu après à l'hérésie dans la Civilisation de l'Occident médiéval) plus de nuances. Son intérêt me semble ensuite se détourner pour l'essentiel des hérétiques (mis à part les joachimites liés aux franciscains spirituels), c'est-à-dire du pôle fondamentaliste (on dirait aujourd'hui «intégriste») du christianisme médiéval, au profit des forces les plus progressistes qui, au sein même de l'institution ecclésiale, oeuvraient à la transformation sociale et idéologique du monde médiéval: le changement social venait moins des hérétiques, qui avaient les yeux rivés sur la lettre des Ecritures, que des maîtres de l'université et plus largement des dominicains et des franciscains qui, selon le mot du Père Chenu, avaient appris à considérer la théologie comme une «science» et entendaient donner toutes ses chances à la raison face à la foi.

En 1964 (l'auteur n'a alors que quarante ans...), *La Civilisation de l'Occident médiéval* vient couronner la première étape de sa carrière scientifique. Ce gros livre (que l'auteur aurait souhaité plus abondant encore) dessine presque tout le programme des recherches ultérieures. A le relire aujourd'hui, on est frappé en effet d'y découvrir en germe une multitude de fils que l'auteur a ensuite déroulés, qu'il s'agisse du corps (dans un monde dominé par les aléas de la nature et la précarité de l'existence), de la parole et des gestes, des rêves et du rire, ou encore de l'imaginaire de l'au-delà (même si l'intuition du purgatoire comme espace-temps spécifique ne se précisera que plus tard). Ce qui s'exprime aussi dans ce livre, c'est

une conception renouvelée de l'explication marxiste traditionnelle: loin d'être réduites à une «superstructure» -le mot a fait de plus en plus horreur à l'auteur-, les «mentalités, sensibilités, attitudes» (mots qui font écho aux «façons de sentir et de penser» analysées par Marc Bloch dans l'un des chapitres les plus novateurs de la *Société Féodale*) s'articulent avec les «structures spatiales et temporelles» et les conditions de la «vie matérielle» pour rendre compte des rapports de domination dans la «société chrétienne», où l'Eglise possède la terre et tient les clefs du ciel.

Il a pu sembler ensuite que Jacques Le Goff était plus un auteur d'articles qu'un homme de livres. Mais chacune de ses études, dont les plus importantes ont été réunies dans *Pour un Autre Moyen Age* (1977) puis dans *L'imaginaire médiéval* (1985), a ouvert de nouvelles portes, déplacé les points de vue, posé des problèmes alors inédits et qui ont été assimilés depuis par tous les médiévistes, au sujet par exemple de l'opposition médiévale du «temps de l'Eglise» et du «temps du marchand» ou des rapports entre «culture folklorique» et «culture cléricale». On lui doit en particulier d'avoir situé l'«imaginaire» au centre du fonctionnement et du processus de reproduction de la société médiévale, par l'importance qu'il accorde au «folklore» (avec Saint Marcel et le dragon ou encore Mélusine), au «merveilleux» (avec ses recherches sur «l'horizon onirique» de l'Océan indien, ou sur les *mirabilia* compilés par Gervais de Tilbury), aux rêves et à leur interprétation, dont il fait à partir de 1971 un observatoire privilégié du passage de l'Antiquité païenne au christianisme. Le christianisme et l'Eglise seraient responsables d'un «blocage» des rêves durant le Haut Moyen Age, avant que les transformations sociales et idéologiques du XIIe siècle n'autorisent une expression renouvelée de l'activité onirique et une véritable «démocratisation» des rêves dont les littératures latine et vernaculaire se font l'écho.

Toutes ces avancées de l'auteur furent rendues possibles par la prise en compte attentive de l'anthropologie sociale et culturelle, dont les années 60 et 70 marquent –spécialement en France- l'extraordinaire essor au sein des sciences sociales (notamment avec Claude Lévi-Strauss, à qui est explicitement dédié l'article «Lévi-Strauss en Brocéliande» écrit en collaboration avec Pierre Vidal-Naquet et consacré aux structures narratives et anthropologiques d'un roman de Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain ou le Chevalier au lion*). Elles résultent aussi d'une compréhension subtile de la complexité de la culture médiévale: tournant le dos à toute représentation dualiste du Moyen Age (par exemple une opposition radicale entre dominants et dominés ou entre sacré et profane), privilégiant au contraire les signes du compromis et de la négociation, Jacques Le Goff identifie des pôles idéologiques intermédiaires, par exemple, au XIIe siècle, celui des *milites* qui, en s'appropriant les thèmes et les figures du «folklore», trouvent le moyen de se distinguer de la culture ecclésiastique, ou au XIIIe siècle, celui des Ordres Mendiants –les religieux ne sont ni des moines, ni des clercs séculiers- qui enfoncent un coin entre le jeune pouvoir de la bourgeoisie et le pouvoir traditionnel de l'évêque et du chapitre des chanoines. Le lieu par excellence de cette complexité, de ces entre-deux, c'est la ville, organisme renaissant dont le rôle apparaît comme étant de plus en plus central dans la société et la culture médiévales. Du reste, à l'opposition antique de la ville et de la campagne (*urbs / rus*), Jacques Le Goff substitue avec bonheur un autre couple, qui lui paraît plus pertinent pour analyser les structures idéologiques médiévales: celui de la ville et du désert, ce «désert-forêt» que les romans courtois mettent en scène et où les ermites trouvent refuge (1980). Ainsi campée dans une

représentation d'ensemble des structures mentales du Moyen Âge, la ville retient toute son attention parce qu'elle est le berceau de la modernité: celle du temps des marchands et de l'horloge mécanique, celle de la «nouvelle parole» des Mendians, celle des *mediocres* auxquels le purgatoire offrira, pour ainsi dire, un lieu de l'au-delà à leur mesure.

Toutes ces réflexions, Jacques le Goff les a partagées avec ses collègues et ses étudiants au fur et à mesure qu'il les formulaient. Car peu d'historiens ont eu comme lui le souci de développer les formes collectives du travail scientifique. En témoignent dès 1974 les trois volumes de *Faire de l'Histoire*, publiés en collaboration avec Pierre Nora. En proclamant la nécessité de trois «nouveau» -celles des «problèmes», des «approches» et des «objets»- l'ouvrage fait figure de manifeste de la nouvelle manière d'écrire et de penser l'histoire, telle qu'elle s'est développée autour des *Annales* et de l'Ecole des Hautes Études pour innover peu à peu l'ensemble de la recherche historique. Quelques années plus tard, le *Dictionnaire de la Nouvelle Histoire* (codirigé en 1978 avec Jacques Revel et Roger Chartier), qui ne devait être originalement que la version vulgarisée de ce même programme scientifique, remporta un succès inattendu et s'imposa à son tour comme un livre de référence. Puis fut lancée la série des volumes publiés au Seuil sur l' *Histoire de la France urbaine* (1980, ouvrage dirigé par G. Duby, le second tome l'étant par Jacques Le Goff) – et l' *Histoire de la France religieuse* (1988, codirigée avec René Rémond). Plus tard viendra *L'Homme médiéval* (paru en italien en 1987 et en français en 1989), puis le *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'Occident médiéval* (1999, co-dirigé avec Jean-Claude Schmitt), qui n'a de dictionnaire que le nom, puisque l'idée était plutôt de proposer à plus de soixante historiens venus de multiples pays de réfléchir sur près d'une centaine de concepts-clefs de l'anthropologie historique, souvent associés deux par deux (par exemple «corps et âme», «centre et périphérie», «guerre et croisade», «justice et paix»).

Son goût du travail collectif, Jacques le Goff l'a surtout montré dans son séminaire hebdomadaire (qu'il anima jusqu'à sa retraite en 1992) et qui consistait le plus souvent en une explication de documents propice au libre débat et aux échanges interdisciplinaires. Jacques le Goff a hésité sur le titre de sa direction d'études. Dans un premier temps, il revendiqua le double patronage de l'histoire et de la sociologie. A partir de 1975, «anthropologie historique» s'est définitivement imposé. Il s'agissait d'afficher l'introduction des problématiques, des méthodes, des objets de l'anthropologie sociale et culturelle dans les préoccupations et les manières de faire de l'historien, mais en soumettant en même temps ces emprunts aux exigences de la diachronie. La synthèse s'est révélée d'autant plus féconde que le souci de Jacques Le Goff de ne pas se laisser aveugler par les faits isolés, mais de penser toujours en terme de relations, le portait à accueillir les principes de l'anthropologie structurale. Mais il s'est toujours préoccupé d'ancrer l'analyse structurale dans des contextes idéologiques et sociaux précis et de déployer dans la profondeur du temps historique les ensembles de relations d'opposition et d'homologie qui définissent les structures.

Les séminaires servirent aussi de caisse de résonance et de première mise à l'épreuve des deux grandes enquêtes que Jacques Le Goff anima à partir de 1968 dans le cadre du Centre de recherches historiques de l'Ecole des hautes études: la première, sur «la ville et les ordres mendiants», visait à définir les critères contemporains du fait urbain. L'auteur partit de l'hypothèse ingénieuse selon laquelle les

religieux Mendiants avaient consciemment cherché à s'installer au plus près des populations qu'ils souhaitaient évangéliser; ils devaient donc avoir leur idée de ce qu'était alors une ville. Ni le seul critère juridique (telle la présence d'une charte de franchise ou d'un conseil urbain), ni le seul critère militaire (telle la présence d'une muraille), ne suffisaient à définir la ville médiévale: ce qui était en jeu était plutôt une notion approximative –mais souvent explicite dans les documents– du nombre des habitants, de la taille de la localité, de ses mesures internes, des richesses susceptibles de supporter l'installation de un à quatre couvents Mendiants, ce nombre variable permettant d'établir une hiérarchie des villes. Dans le cas de la France, cette classification se vérifie dans les grandes lignes au XIV^e siècle lorsque le roi convoque aux Etats et assemblées ses «bonnes villes» susceptibles de répondre avantageusement à ses demandes fiscales: elles ne sont autres que les villes «à quatre ou trois couvents mendiants». L'écho rencontré par l'enquête dans d'autres pays d'Europe (jusqu'en Hongrie) a permis de vérifier et de nuancer l'hypothèse de départ.

L'autre enquête a porté sur la littérature des *exempla*, dont l'essor est du, lui aussi, aux frères Mendiants. Cette fois, il s'agissait d'étudier la «nouvelle parole» médiévale dans ses formes (le récit bref) et ses fonctions (la persuasion, la normalisation des comportements et des croyances). Les compromis entre culture orale, voire «folklorique», et culture lettrée, est au centre du développement des *exempla*, de leur compilation et de leur usage massif par les prédicateurs. L'enquête se poursuit aujourd'hui à une échelle internationale (avec notamment la collaboration d'une équipe espagnole) et elle a conduit à la publication de nombreux instruments de travail et éditions et tout récemment à l'édition critique du premier volume du recueil d'*exempla* du dominicain du XIII^e siècle Etienne de Bourbon (2003, sous la direction de Jacques Berlioz et Jean-Luc Eichenlaub).

Parallèlement Jacques Le Goff poursuivait dans ses travaux personnels son exploration de la «civilisation médiévale». Deux gros livres vinrent lentement à maturité, préparés par toute une série d'articles: *La naissance du purgatoire* (1981) et *Saint Louis* (1996). Ces livres couronnent véritablement toute son œuvre.

S'il est question dans les textes théologiques et pénitentiels, dès les premiers siècles du christianisme, du feu purgatoire ou des peines purgatoires qui attendaient après la mort ceux qui n'ont commis de leur vivant que des péchés véniels, c'est à partir de la seconde moitié du XII^e siècle seulement que se rencontre le substantif «le purgatoire» (*purgatorium*). Cette apparition marque une étape nouvelle dans la géographie de l'au-delà et la spatialisation des croyances. D'abord dans les textes, plus tard dans les images, elle signifie l'émergence d'un troisième lieu de l'au-delà, antichambre du paradis, lequel en est l'exutoire exclusif puisque du purgatoire une âme en peine ne retombe jamais en enfer. La nouvelle croyance entraîne avec elle de nouvelles dévotions et souligne l'importance accrue du jugement particulier de l'âme juste après la mort. Le jugement particulier anticipe sur le jugement dernier de tous les morts à la fin des temps. Il en découle un renforcement des solidarités entre les vivants et les morts, et toute une économie de la mémoire, dont l'Eglise a tiré le plus grand parti sur les plans matériel et idéologique. L'ouvrage est fondamental en ce qu'il a «inventé» vraiment son objet: chacun pensait savoir ce qu'était le purgatoire, qui semblait avoir existé depuis les débuts du christianisme ou du moins les Pères de l'Eglise, en particulier Tertullien. Le mérite de Jacques Le Goff fut, dans ce cas précis comme à d'autres occasions, de dissiper les évidences

en s'intéressant de près à la transformation, minime en apparence, d'un adjectif en un substantif. Mais il n'y a jamais de hasard dans une découverte scientifique: c'est, me semble-t-il, la lecture attentive des textes et l'appréciation du poids de chaque mot et de son histoire, dont les séminaires ont donné l'exemple année après année, qui ont permis à Jacques Le Goff de repérer puis d'interpréter pleinement ce changement significatif.

Dans une historiographie française qui, avec les *Annales*, semblait avoir définitivement renoncé à la biographie comme à l'histoire politique, la publication de *Saint Louis* (1996) ne signifie pas un renoncement ou une concession à l'engouement du large public pour les individualités les plus fortes du passé. Pas plus que *Le dimanche de Bouvines* de Georges Duby ne signifia, en 1973, un retour à «l'histoire bataille»! La question centrale que pose cet énorme livre de près de 1000 pages est celle-ci: «Saint Louis a-t-il existé?» L'interrogation ne signifie évidemment pas que l'auteur mette en doute la réalité de l'existence biologique de Louis IX. Il entend seulement montrer que toute existence historique est construite et que dans le cas d'un personnage aussi important et exceptionnel que le saint roi, cette construction est la résultante de témoignages contradictoires et peut-être inconciliables: ceux des proches conseillers dominicains et franciscains du roi, ceux des moines de Saint-Denis qui poursuivaient leur œuvre séculaire d'historiographie dynastique, celui enfin de Joinville, l'ami proche, compagnon de la croisade d'Égypte, qui au soir de sa vie revendique sa part de la mémoire du saint roi, dans une histoire qui constitue la première autobiographie écrite en langue française et par un laïc.

Saint Louis est donc tout cela à la fois, un «individu» dont la présence singulière ne cesse de se dérober derrière les lieux communs et les images convenues qui contribuent à le dépeindre tout en le masquant. Mais loin de déplorer ou de minimiser l'importance de ces lieux communs, l'auteur en démontre au contraire l'efficacité idéologique et politique, car toutes ces images, qui sans doute voilent le roi «réel», étaient le roi Saint Louis, pour autant que celui se conformait dans ses gestes, ses paroles, ses actions, au portrait idéal que son entourage clérical et lettré lui renvoyait. Cela vaut notamment pour le modèle biblique du roi Josias, que Saint Louis semble reproduire pas à pas quand, après l'échec de la croisade et la captivité aux mains des Sarasins, il promulgue l'ordonnance réformatrice de 1254 et, à l'instar de Josias, place son règne sous le signe de l'austérité.

Le livre sur Saint Louis apporte aussi une démonstration précieuse de ce que l'histoire politique peut attendre du renouvellement historiographique incarné par Jacques le Goff. Dans un article de 1971 repris en 1985 en guise de conclusion à *L'imaginaire médiéval*, il se demandait si «l'histoire politique» était toujours «l'épine dorsale de l'histoire». Rappelant le discrédit dans lequel était tombée l'histoire politique traditionnelle -exclusivement institutionnelle, biographique et événementielle-, il plaidait au contraire pour une histoire des structures et des représentations du politique, celui-ci étant, dans la société médiévale, indissociable du religieux. Le grand exemple est, dès 1924, *Les rois thaumaturges* de Marc Bloch, dont Jacques le Goff a assuré la réédition en 1983 en lui donnant une riche préface.

Il y dit son admiration pour ce livre pionnier, même s'il émet des réserves sur l'opinion finale et encore très «voltairienne» de l'auteur au sujet de la croyance au miracle royal, qui ne serait, disait Marc Bloch, qu'une «erreur collective». Il est en effet paradoxal de voir Marc Bloch - qui exhortait les historiens à ne pas se faire «procureurs» - juger les hommes du passé à l'aune de son propre rationalisme. Jacques

Le Goff rectifie en plaidant pour une meilleure compréhension de la cohérence des systèmes symboliques, des croyances et des rituels du passé. C'est l'exigence qu'il illustre dans son article célèbre sur «le rituel symbolique de la vassalité» (1976) ou encore dans sa contribution sur «Reims, ville du sacre» aux *Lieux de mémoire* de Pierre Nora (1984) et enfin, en collaboration avec Jean-Claude Bonne, Eric Palazzo et Marie-Noël Colette, dans son analyse du Sacre royal à l'époque de Saint Louis à partir du manuscrit enluminé Latin 1246 de la Bibliothèque nationale de France (2001).

Dans tous ces travaux, Jacques le Goff n'a jamais cessé de mener de front la recherche empirique et l'interrogation sur de grands problèmes d'histoire, sur sa propre démarche et plus généralement sur les méthodes des historiens. Cette réflexion, il ne la mène pas en philosophe, se méfiant du reste de la «philosophie de l'histoire», mais en interrogeant concrètement la validité des concepts mis en oeuvre par les historiens et des instruments qu'ils forgent et appliquent à leurs objets de recherche. A ce titre, il est sans doute, de tous les historiens français, celui qui a cherché à définir avec le plus de souplesse et à justifier avec le plus de conviction la notion d'«histoire des mentalités». Mais il en a usé d'une manière pragmatique et sans jamais en faire un champ clos de la recherche. A ses yeux, la notion de «mentalités» –cette notion essentiellement «ambiguë» (1974)- a permis au contraire d'ouvrir les territoires, d'abattre les frontières, de respecter la complexité des réalités historiques et l'indissoluble interaction des facteurs matériels et idéels. Toujours citées au pluriel, les «mentalités» seraient l'antidote de toute spécialisation excessive, l'ennemie d'une histoire des idées oublieuse des facteurs sociaux, d'une histoire événementielle ignorante du temps long des structures –et singulièrement de ce «long Moyen Âge» qu'il ne cesse de réclamer et qui mène à ses yeux de l'Antiquité tardive jusqu'à la Révolution industrielle- ou encore d'une histoire qui, caricature du marxisme, prétendrait opposer mécaniquement les «superstructures» aux «infrastructures».

C'est ainsi que dans la démonstration du rôle moteur de la croyance au purgatoire dans la société urbaine et l'économie monétaire du Moyen Âge central, Jacques Le Goff a bien expliqué comment les marchands et mêmes les usuriers voulaient à la fois la bourse et la vie, c'est-à-dire obtenir un profit matériel et sauver leur âme, gagner simultanément sur les deux tableaux, inséparables, de l'économie et de la religion. A cette époque, aime-t-il à dire, «les valeurs du ciel descendent sur la terre» –cette formule choc se trouvait déjà dans la *Civilisation de l'Occident médiéval* de 1964- la société chrétienne du XIII^e siècle élaborant une justification religieuse et morale de ses activités et de ses ambitions mondaines, de sa faim d'argent et même de l'usure, parvenant, moyennant finance, à ravir à Dieu le contrôle du temps ici bas et surtout après la mort, un temps qui s'achète au juste prix des messes commandées à l'Eglise pour abrégé les épreuves purgatoires des âmes pécheresses et hâter leur accès définitif au paradis. Bien avant de bénéficier de l'éthique protestante, comme l'a avancé Max Weber, le capitalisme ne fut-il pas redevable de ses premiers développements à la croyance au purgatoire et à la rationalité scolastique? Contre Jakob Burkhardt, Max Weber ou Norbert Elias, il faut entendre que la modernité européenne ne date pas de la Renaissance, mais qu'elle s'enracine dans l'espace urbain et intellectuel du XIII^e siècle.

Faute de pouvoir préciser ici l'apport de chacun des travaux de Jacques Le Goff, il me faut avant tout insister sur le foisonnement de son oeuvre, que sous-tend la

conviction que rien ne peut jamais s'isoler, que tous les aspects d'une civilisation entrent nécessairement en relation, en résonnance les uns avec les autres. L'histoire du sel, la culture matérielle, le travail, la ville, les universités, les hérésies, les ordres mendiants, les *exempla*, le folklore, les gestes, les rituels vassaliques et royaux, le rire, les rêves: il semble qu'aucun aspect de la civilisation médiévale n'ait laissé Jacques Le Goff indifférent. Mais cette sorte de curiosité boulimique et cette faculté admirable de mettre en relation, d'évoquer des rapports imprévus, ne se confondent pas avec les hasards d'un vagabondage intellectuel: elles construisent un projet historique et historiographique fort dont les principes ont été pensés et posés de longue date.

De plus, Jacques Le Goff n'est pas que médiéviste: héritier là encore de Marc Bloch, il s'est non seulement toujours soucié de la longue durée, mais insiste, dans ses réflexions comme dans ses actions, sur la relation mutuelle entre le passé et le présent. Comme historien des intellectuels ou de l'espace urbain, c'est dans l'observation du présent qu'il trouve une large part de son inspiration. Comme citoyen, inversement, c'est de l'aptitude de l'historien à dénouer les fils embrouillés d'une situation sociale passée qu'il tire sa lucidité et sa liberté de jugement face aux problèmes de notre société. Il l'a montré en prenant parti dans divers débats publics qui ont agité la société française ou encore en s'engageant, en 1981, aux côtés des intellectuels et des ouvriers polonais luttant pour la démocratie et la liberté. Plus récemment, il s'est plusieurs fois prononcé, y compris dans deux livres: *La vieille Europe et la nôtre* (1994) et *L'Europe racontée aux enfants* (1996), pour la construction européenne, préparée de longue date, en dépit de tous les facteurs de désunion, par les convergences unificatrices de l'histoire et de la culture du vieux continent. La construction européenne n'est pas seulement pour lui un objet d'histoire, elle est tout autant un horizon politique et un espoir. C'est dans cet esprit qu'il vient d'achever un nouveau livre dont le titre en forme de question est: *L'Europe est-elle née au Moyen Âge?* Le plan, chronologique, identifie cinq étapes successives (Antiquité tardive, Époque carolingienne, An mil, XIIe-XIIIe siècle, XVe siècle) qui ont permis, sur un plan ou un autre, une formulation et un apport nouveaux à l'idée ancienne d'Europe (mais le mot a changé de sens au cours des siècles) et à la structuration d'un espace géographique, social, idéologique ayant contribué à un processus toujours en cours aujourd'hui. La réponse à la question est donc ambiguë: la période médiévale fut en effet déterminante dans la formation de l'Europe telle que nous la connaissons aujourd'hui et en même temps il est et restera sans doute impossible d'assigner aucune «date de naissance» à l'Europe.

Voici l'homme, voici l'œuvre: ce ne serait que justice maintenant d'apprécier son immense influence, tant en France qu'à l'étranger, sur les médiévistes et aussi les autres historiens. De cela aussi il serait difficile de parler en conservant à son propos une stricte objectivité. Mais –comme on dit– cela est autre histoire.

Chronologie

1924. Né à Toulon, le premier janvier.
 1945. Il a été admis à l'École Normale Supérieure, où il a passé cinq ans qui ont marqué profondément sa carrière académique.
 1947-48. Il a fait un séjour scientifique d'un an à Prague, pour faire son diplôme d'études supérieures sur les débuts de l'université de Charles IV au XIV^e siècle. Là-bas il a vécu le 'Coup de Prague' du 20 février 1948.
 1950. Il a été nommé professeur au lycée d'Amiens. Il connaît Fernand Braudel, qui va marquer sa vie académique à partir de ce moment.
 1951-53. Dans ces années il a fait des autres séjours: à Oxford et à l'École Française de Rome.
 1954-1959. Fut assistant de Michel Mollat à l'Université de Lille.
 1956. Apparition dans la collection 'Que sais-je?' des Presses Universitaires de France de sa première œuvre *Marchands et banquiers au Moyen Âge*.
 1957. Il publie une de ses œuvres les plus connues, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*.
 1959. Grâce à Fernand Braudel mais surtout à Maurice Lombard il entre à la VI^e Section de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études.
 1962. Il fut élu directeur d'études de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études.
 1964. Il publie son œuvre *La Civilisation de l'Occident médiéval* qui couronne la première étape de sa carrière scientifique.
 1972-1977. Il devient président de L'École Pratique des Hautes Études. Il succède à Fernand Braudel et, en 1977, il cède sa place à François Furet.
 1978. Crée avec Jean-Claude Schmitt, le Groupe d'Anthropologie Historique de l'Occident Médiéval. *Dictionnaire de la Nouvelle Histoire* codirigé en 1978 avec Jacques Revel et Roger Chartier, qui était originellement la version vulgarisée de ce même programme scientifique.
 1981. Publication de *La naissance du purgatoire*.
 1987. Il a reçu le Grand Prix National d'Histoire.
 1991. Il obtient la Médaille d'or du CNRS.
 1996-2004. Des années très fructifères de production scientifique. Il réalisa la biographie de Saint-Louis (1996), celle de Saint François d'Assise (1999), le *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'Occident médiéval*, co-dirigé avec Jean-Claude Schmitt.

Bibliographie

1. Ouvrages individuelles

- Marchands et banquiers du Moyen Âge* (Paris: PUF, coll. 'Que sais-je?', 1956)
Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge (Paris: Le Seuil, 1957)
Le Moyen Âge (Paris: Bordas, 1962)
La civilisation de l'Occident Médiéval (Paris: Arthaud, 1964)
Les propos de Saint Louis (Paris: Gallimard, 1974)
Pour un autre Moyen Âge (Paris: Gallimard, 1977)
La naissance du purgatoire (Paris: Gallimard, 1981)
L'Apogée de la chrétienté: v. 1180-v. 1330 (Paris: Bordas, 1982)
L'imaginaire médiéval (Paris: Gallimard, 1985)
La Bourse et la vie: économie et religion au Moyen Âge (Paris: Hachette, 1986)
Histoire et mémoire (Paris: Gallimard, 1988)
Du silence à la parole: droit du travail, société, Etat, 1830-1985 (Paris: Calligrammes, 1989)
Le 13^e siècle: l'apogée de la chrétienté (Paris: Bordas, 1992)
Le XIII^e siècle: l'apogée de la chrétienté v. 1180-v. 1330 (Paris: Bordas, 1992)
La vieille Europe et la nôtre (Paris: Seuil, 1994)
L'Europe racontée aux jeunes (Paris: Seuil, 1996)

Saint Louis (Paris: Gallimard, 1996)

Un autre Moyen Age (Paris: Gallimard (1999) [Comprend: *Pour un autre Moyen Age, L'Occident médiéval et le temps, L'imaginaire médiéval, La naissance du Purgatoire, Les limbes, La bourse et la vie, Le rire dans la société médiévale*]).

Saint François d'Assise (Paris: Gallimard, 1999)

Un Moyen Age en images (Paris: Hazan, 2000)

Cinq personnages d'hier pour aujourd'hui: Bouddha, Abélard, saint François, Michelet, Bloch (Paris: La Fabrique, 2001)

A la recherche du Moyen Age (Paris: Louis Audibert, 2003)

Le Dieu du Moyen Age (Paris: Bayard, 2003)

L'Europe est-elle née au Moyen-Age? (Paris: Seuil, 2003)

Héros du Moyen-âge, Le roi, le saint, au Moyen Age (Paris: Gallimard, 2004)

2. Ouvrages en édition et collaboration

Hérésies et sociétés dans l'Europe pré-industrielle, XI^e-XVIII^e siècle: communications et débats du colloque de Royaumont, éd. (Paris: Mouton, 1968).

La Nouvelle Histoire, (Paris: CEPL, 1978), (avec Roger Chartier et Jacques Revel).

Le Charivari: actes, (Paris: École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1980), (avec Jean-Claude Schmitt).

Faire de l'histoire, 3 vols., (Paris: Gallimard, 1986), (avec Pierre Nora).

Intellectuels français, intellectuels hongrois: XII^e-XX^e (Paris: CNRS, 1986), (avec Béla Kopeczi).

Histoire de la France religieuse volume, 3 vols (Paris: Seuil, 1988-1992), (avec René Rémond).

L'Homme médiéval, éd. (Paris: Seuil, 1989).

Histoire de la France, volume 2. L'Etat et les pouvoirs, (Paris: Seuil, 1989), (avec André Burguière et Jacques Revel).

Histoire de la France urbaine, volume 2., (Paris: Seuil, 1998), (avec André Chédeville et Jacques Rossiaud).

Le Moyen Age aujourd'hui: trois regards contemporains sur le Moyen Age: histoire, théologie, cinéma, Paris: Léopard d'or, 1998), (avec Guy Lobrichon).

Dictionnaire raisonné de l'Occident médiéval, (Paris: Fayard, 1999), (avec Jean-Claude Schmitt).

Le sacre royal à l'époque de Saint-Louis: d'après le manuscrit latin 1246 de la BNF, (Paris: Gallimard, 2001), (avec Jean-Claude Bonne, Eric Palazzo et Marie-Noël Colette).

Les calendriers: leurs enjeux dans l'espace et le temps: actes de colloque, Centre culturel de Cerisy-la-Salle, 1^{er}-8 juillet 2000 (Paris: Somogy, 2002), (avec Jean Lefort et Perrine Mane)

Une histoire du corps au Moyen Age, (Paris: Liana Lévi, 2003), (avec Nicolas Truong).

3. Ouvrages sur Jacques Le Goff

Une vie pour l'histoire (entretiens avec Marc Heurgon), (Paris: La Découverte, 1996)

L'ogre historien. Autour de Jacques Le Goff, éd. par Jacques Revel et Jean-Claude Schmitt (Paris: Gallimard, 1998)

Albert Zimmermann (1928)

Elisabeth Reinhardt
(Universidad de Navarra)

Of the various encounters I had with Albert Zimmermann, the most memorable one was the long conversation I had with him in Cologne, published later on in *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia*. We had a very remarkable conversation, but what impressed me most was the fact that it took place in the early afternoon of September 11, 2001. At that time, we had no inkling of the great disaster taking place then in New York. The last topic of our interview had been about the relevance and interest of St. Thomas Aquinas among today's youth. Zimmermann commented that St. Thomas Aquinas dealt with a wide range of philosophical topics including questions of general interest, such as the person as bearer of intellectual potencies; human acts and responsibility; the human person as lord and administrator of creation. He said: "If one pays close attention to his (St. Thomas') arguments concerning moral principles, one can arrive at the conclusion that the so called categorical imperative and the much disputed ethics of discourse do not transcend the principle of *secundum virtutem agere est secundum rationem agere*. In the best of cases, these approaches make virtual ethics possible"¹. In hindsight, these words become even more meaningful after what had happened that unforgettable day.

Biographical facts

Albert Zimmermann was born in 1928 in Bergheim/Erft, near Cologne. His parents were secondary school teachers. Zimmermann's school years coincided with the Nazi regime and the outbreak of the Second World War. At a young age, he already assimilated values such as truth, freedom, justice, values which clearly clashed with a totalitarian and inhuman system². His philosophical interest was awakened after finishing high school in 1945/46, at the haste of the Second World War. His high school teacher in German language and literature had the talent for fostering dialogue among his students by relating literary themes with philosophical questions. Through the classroom exposure to philosophy, the young student of seventeen years old was aroused to thinking about the problem of truth in the face of religious divisiveness in Germany. The question as to "who is right?" was firmly linked to his conviction that the criterion of truth was found in demonstra-

¹ Elisabeth Reinhardt, 'Conversación en Colonia con Albert Zimmermann', in *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia*, 11 (2002), 303-26. This conversation is subsequently included in the book, *Historiadores que hablan de la historia. Veintidós trayectorias intelectuales*, ed. by Elisabeth Reinhardt (Pamplona: Eunsa, 2002), pp. 542-75.

² The deep marks left by the experiences of the National Socialist regime and the Second World War on Zimmermann are reflected in the said conversation, Reinhardt, 545-553. Regarding his post-war experience, see Albert Zimmermann, 'La Guerre est finie! Un jeune Allemand et les soldats américains (février-mars 1945)', in *Pierre d'Angle*, 8 (2002) pp. 62-76.

tion. Plagued by these anxieties, he enrolled in the Philosophical-Theological School Sankt Georgen, which was then located in Limburg/Lahn.

Having finished the *Philosophicum* and following the advice and example of his father, he studied Mathematics and Physics at the University of Bonn and University of Cologne. According to Zimmermann, he took these studies for "pragmatic reasons," abiding by his father's suggestion and because he himself was personally interested in these subjects. He liked Mathematics "because of the peculiarity of its object and its strict methodological demands", and Physics because he considered it as "the key to the study of nature"³. The influence of Zimmermann's scientific formation and his study of the different methodologies would later on be reflected in his intellectual work, concretely, in the rigor, precision and wide-ranging theme of his philosophical studies.

In the University of Cologne, Zimmermann attended the philosophy classes and seminars which were obligatory subjects for those aspiring to be secondary school teachers. Josef Koch (1885-1967), doctor in Philosophy and Theology, an expert in medieval thought, especially in Meister Eckhart and Nicholas of Cusa, had the professorial chair in Philosophy since 1950. On that same year, he also founded the Thomas-Institut in this university. Influenced by Clemens Baeumker whose classes he attended during his student years in Strasbourg, Koch employed the direct reading of medieval authors in his classes. It proved to be an effective method against the then prevailing prejudice towards the Middle Ages. His teaching opened up new horizons for his students and encouraged some of them to pursue philosophy as was the case of Zimmermann⁴. Koch was willing to be the thesis adviser of Zimmermann in philosophy once the latter would finish his studies and pass the first state exam in Mathematics and Physics in 1952. Zimmermann worked on his thesis at the same time as he was doing his practicum in Pedagogy, an obligatory requirement for high school teachers. In 1954, Zimmermann passed the second state exam. Soon afterwards, he began to teach Mathematics and Physics in a secondary school. In 1955, he defended his doctoral thesis. The topic of his dissertation was a fragment of a commentary of Siger of Brabant on the *Physics* of Aristotle, a manuscript discovered by Anneliese Maier. Zimmermann's thesis focused on the critical edition of this text and the authenticity of other manuscripts arising from this discovery⁵.

After Zimmermann finished his thesis, Koch broached up the idea of gathering and revising medieval commentaries to the *Physics* and *Metaphysics* of Aristotle. In 1957, Zimmermann took a study leave in order to work on these topics in different libraries, in Cambridge, Oxford, London and Paris, with the help of a grant from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*. These studies led to his interest regarding the

³ Reinhardt, 555.

⁴ Regarding the intellectual and personal profile of Josef Koch whom Zimmermann considered as his principal mentor, see Albert Zimmermann, 'Staunen, vertrauen, lernen – Student am Thomas-Institut,' in *Ende und Vollendung. Eschatologische Perspektiven im Mittelalter*, hrsg. von Jan A. Aertsen und Martin Pickavé (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter ["Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 29], 2002), pp. 29-35. See also Erich Meuthen, 'Das Thomas-Institut. Vor- und Gründungsgeschichte,' in the same volume, pp. 3-20; and Wolfgang Kluxen, '50 Jahre Thomas-Institut: Erinnerung an die Anfänge,' pp. 21-28. This volume commemorates, in its first section, the 50th anniversary of the Thomas-Institut, pp. 3-65.

⁵ Albert Zimmermann, *Die Quaestiones des Siger von Brabant zur Physik des Aristoteles*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Köln, (1955) 1956.

determining object or *subiectum* of the Metaphysics of the Middle Ages. Later on, he would take on this matter as the topic for his *Habilitation*⁶. He obtained the *venia legendi* in philosophy in December 1961. An annotated list of the manuscripts studied by Zimmermann prior to his *Habilitation* was published in 1971⁷.

Zimmermann is a member of the Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale since its foundation in 1958. He attended its first International Congress that same year in Louvain. This occasion allowed him to meet many renowned scholars from different countries and thus was able to acquaint himself with the main initiatives being carried out in the field of medieval studies. Years later, he would become president of this society from 1992 to 1997⁸.

After obtaining his *Habilitation*, Zimmermann started giving philosophy classes at the University of Cologne while at the same time he continued teaching in a secondary school. In 1964, he got a job as scientific adviser and professor in said university and consequently left his post in secondary school. Shortly afterwards, he was named Ordinary Professor in the School of Pedagogy of Siegen (at present, University of Siegen). In 1967, upon the sudden demise of Paul Wilpert⁹, Zimmermann succeeded him in the Philosophy Chair of Cologne. He remained at this post until his retirement in 1993 while simultaneously directing the Thomas-Institut. He became Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy for two years. Besides, he actively collaborated with the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* for ten years.

From 1970 until the year he retired, Zimmermann also worked as scientific director of an institute for the continuing formation of secondary school teachers. This institute was an inter-diocesan initiative of Rhineland Westphalia aimed at improving the professional competence of teachers and providing them with the principles of Christian anthropology. In recognition of his service, Zimmermann received the Order of St. Gregory in 1993. Upon his retirement, in July of that same year the University of Cologne organized a symposium in his honor with the title *Philosophie und geistiges Erbe des Mittelalters*. A two-volume *Festschrift* was published the following year, entitled *Scientia und ars im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*¹⁰. The latest distinction

⁶ Zimmermann, *Ontologie oder Metaphysik? Die Diskussion über den Gegenstand der Metaphysik im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert. Texte und Untersuchungen* (Leiden-Köln: Brill, ["Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters", 8], 1965). The expanded and updated second edition was published by Peeters, Leuven, 1998.

⁷ Zimmermann, *Verzeichnis ungedruckter Kommentare zur Metaphysik und Physik des Aristoteles. Aus der Zeit von etwa 1250-1350*, I (Leiden-Köln: Brill, ["Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters", 9], 1971).

⁸ Zimmermann's memories of the foundation and the First International Congress can be found in: Albert Zimmermann, 'La fondation de la Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale', in *L'élaboration du vocabulaire philosophique au Moyen Âge: actes du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve et Leuven, 12-14 septembre 1998*, ed. by Jacqueline Hamesse et Carlos Steel (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), pp. 1-9.

⁹ Paul Wilpert (1906-1.1.1967) succeeded Koch as director of the Thomas-Institut in 1954. Zimmermann's contact with this prestigious professor led him to the works of Nicholas of Cusa. He makes reference to him in the article cited in footnote 4, 'Staunen, vertrauen, lernen – Student am Thomas-Institut,' pp. 31-32.

¹⁰ *Philosophie und geistiges Erbe des Mittelalters*, mit Beiträgen von Jan Aertsen, Klaus Jacobi, Georg Wieland und Rémi Brague (Köln-Winksele: Peeters, 1994). - *Scientia und ars im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, hrsg. von Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg und Andreas Speer (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter ["Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 22], 1994).

granted him came in 1999 when he was named ordinary member of the *Pontificia Accademia di San Tommaso* in Rome. Zimmermann continues to publish specialized articles in his field as well as topics of general interest, pedagogy and contemporary philosophy.

Publications

Zimmermann has a wide array of written works: monographs, editions and co-editions of sources and specialized journals, translations, journal articles, conference papers, dictionary entries.¹¹ His first monographs were derived from his dissertation and his *Habilitation* thesis. These works were mainly centered on the scholarly discussions of the medieval reception of Aristotle. I will go back to this point when I examine his scholarly contributions.

Aside from his specific interest in medieval studies, Zimmermann was also attracted by contemporary philosophy, perhaps motivated by his dialogue with his colleagues and students. His 1975 work on philosophical anthropology attest to this. Specifically, he makes a critical analysis of the main contributions of modern philosophy and he offers some points for reflection¹². A recent monograph was published borne of his efforts to acquaint his students with Thomas Aquinas through philosophical questions that stand the test of time. He is able to cut across generation gaps without falling into anachronism, teaching today's young intellectuals "to read Thomas," which is precisely the title of his book¹³. Prior to its publication, he had worked on the translation of the *Quaestio 1* of *De Veritate*, a text which he used in a philosophy seminar, prompted by the desire to introduce his students to the teachings of St. Thomas.

During his 26-year stay as head of the Thomas-Institut, he collaborated and pushed for the publication of several edition works, publishing various medieval sources¹⁴. Besides other collected papers, he continued the series *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* of which sixteen volumes were published while he directed this Institute¹⁵, and the series *Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* which came out with thirty four volumes during the same period¹⁶. Zimmermann also took part

¹¹ For an updated curriculum operum (until 1993), see the compilation done by Wolfram Klatt in *Scientia und ars im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, I, pp. xxiii-xxx.

¹² Albert Zimmermann, *Der Mensch in der modernen Philosophie*, (Essen: Ludgerus ["Christliche Strukturen in der modernen Welt", 14], 1975).

¹³ Albert Zimmermann, *Thomas lesen*, (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt: Frommann-Holzboog ["legenda", 2], 2000).

¹⁴ *Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem/Averrois Opera*. Editioni curandae praesident Albertus Zimmermann u.a. (Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi), Leuven, Madrid, Jerusalem u.a., 1983 sqq.; Meister Eckhart, *Die deutschen und lateinischen Werke: Die lateinischen Werke*, hrsg. von Albert Zimmermann und Loris Sturlese (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992-1994).

¹⁵ Of special interest is the series *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter, 1970 sqq.), which, among other themes includes the symposia of medievalists (*Kölner Mediaevistentagungen*). Volumes 7-22 were published while Zimmermann directed the Thomas-Institut; he personally edited twelve, and coedited two of them. – The collected papers coedited by Zimmermann comprise a homage to St. Albert the Great (see *infra*, "Selected Bibliography", 2, p. 330), a work on historical metrology (see footnote 30) and a volume on education (see footnote 36).

¹⁶ This series was published by Brill in Leiden. It is a collection of specialized studies on philosophy, theology and science in the Middle Ages. During Zimmermann's direction of the Thomas-Institut vols. 9-42, 1971 ff. of the series were edited.

in the direction of specialized journals such as *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* and *Vivarium*¹⁷. He also collaborated in the following dictionaries: *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* and *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*.

His numerous articles can be grouped according to topic. The majority of them deals with medieval philosophy and reflects specialized studies on manuscripts of commentaries to the *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. He develops in greater detail some aspects which are mentioned only in passing in the corresponding monographs and he engages into dialogue with other views. These studies focus on: Latin Averroism and its proponents; the epistemological status of metaphysics in the High Middle Ages; the analysis of medieval thought in general; some topics in Logic and Philosophy of Nature wherein he examines the different medieval cosmogonies up to the time of Copernicus and Galileo as well as the subjects of evolution, matter and space, and the problem of the eternity of the world. The two medieval thinkers which are prominent in his works are St. Albert the Great and Saint Thomas Aquinas. He examines some aspects of Aquinas which are less studied by specialists, such as *defectus naturalis* and *timor*, slavery, sensible appetite and recreation.

Zimmermann also wrote articles on modern and contemporary philosophy, e.g., Leibniz, Feuerbach, Frege, and Edith Stein. His main interest was anthropology as could be gleaned from his works. His extensive oeuvre also includes articles of general interest such as St. Albert the Great made accessible for the citizens of Cologne, and the Copernican cosmogony made simple for schools broadcasted over the radio.

The principal themes

Among Zimmermann's works, there are certain medieval topics which are constantly present and which he analyzes in greater detail. From these meticulous studies, he develops his own synthesis as expressed in his fundamental convictions.

An outstanding characteristic of his research work is its methodological rigor. He learned this trait from his teacher Josef Koch and from his studies in Physics and Mathematics. Coupled with this influence is his philosophical training, all of which granted him a *forma mentis* that enabled him to combine great theoretical problems with a rigorous intellectual procedure and which helped him to defend his own stand. These qualities were already manifest in his doctoral dissertation. In this initial research work, he took a critical position vis-à-vis Fernand van Steenberghen, the well-known scholar of Siger, and other Louvain scholars. As mentioned above, the first part of the thesis comprises the critical edition of a manuscript of unquestionable Siger authorship which serves as the basis for judging the authenticity of all other manuscripts doubtfully attributed to Siger. In the second part of the dissertation Zimmermann applies this criterion to two of these manuscripts. The result of his study diverges from the conclusions of the Louvain medievalists. In this debate, Gilson admitted that Zimmermann was right and advised him to publish his results

¹⁷ Zimmermann co-directed the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* from 1969 to 1993. He is a member of the Advisory Board of *Vivarium: an international journal for the philosophy and intellectual life of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*.

right away. Koch, however, preferred to wait. The dissertation, finally, was published in two stages and in two places. In 1968, thirteen years after Zimmermann defended his thesis, the much discussed topics of the second part were published in Berlin. However, the critical edition of the ms Borgh 114, whose authenticity was unquestioned, came out in 1974 in Louvain¹⁸. Zimmermann was more interested in historical truth than in the debate itself, convinced that the non-application of the criteria of authenticity could result in the production of some works on Siger of Brabant whose sources were questionable. This inaccuracy, in fact, had its repercussion in major questions, such as the relationship between Siger and St. Thomas Aquinas. Basing himself on the authenticity of the sources, Zimmermann precisely demonstrated that Siger employed texts of St. Thomas, agreeing with St. Thomas on some points and changing his own views, as could be seen in his subsequent distancing from monopsychism. In other aspects, Siger would disagree with St. Thomas, for example, regarding the question of the animation of celestial spheres or astrological determinism. Zimmermann concludes that St. Thomas and Siger were not irreconcilable enemies although Siger did not concur with some Aristotelian interpretations of St. Thomas¹⁹.

Zimmermann's post-doctoral study on unedited commentaries to the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle is a research material of special interest. In one of his visits to Koch, his former teacher asked him about his personal reflections on these works. Zimmermann had observed the diversity of views found in these commentaries regarding the determining object (*subiectum*) of the *Metaphysics*, out of which flowed necessarily the different projects of the metaphysical science and their corresponding methodologies. He thus embarked on a historico-philosophical study of this question using the said manuscripts. It took him three years to finish the project which he eventually used for his *Habilitation* for a university teaching post.

I will now consider the approach and results of this research work. To this day, this study continues to be a point of reference for the history of *Metaphysics*. Keeping in mind that the terms "Metaphysics" and "Ontology" are used in different ways

¹⁸ The first part of the dissertation (cf. footnote 5) is the critical edition of the ms Borgh 114 of the Vatican Library, discovered by A. Maier in 1946. Zimmermann's application of this ms as criterion of authenticity gave rise to the following discrepancies: 1) According to J.J. Duin, the ms P 16.297 of the National Library of Paris was a text of Siger. Zimmermann affirmed that it could probably be so, based not on the proofs given by Duin, but according to internal criteria and therefore not definitive. 2) The ms clm 9559 of the Bavarian National Library was edited by Philippe Delhaye in 1941 under the name of Siger. Zimmermann rejected its authenticity following the criterion of the ms Borgh 114. Thus, the results of his dissertation clearly contradicted the affirmations of Delhaye and van Steenberghen in one aspect, and those of Duin in another. The two parts of the dissertation which were published separately are: 1) The critical edition of the ms P 16.297 and the *status quaestionis* of the research: Albert Zimmermann, *Ein Kommentar zur Physik des Aristoteles. Aus der Pariser Artistenfakultät um 1273*, (Berlin: W. de Gruyter ["Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie", 11], 1968). 2) The text of the ms Borgh 114 excluding the critical discussion: Bernardo Bazan, *Siger de Brabant. Écrits de logique, de morale et de physique* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires ["Philosophes Médiévaux", 14], 1974), pp. 141-84. Van Steenberghen's view can be found in his book *Maître Siger de Brabant* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires ["Philosophes Médiévaux", 21], 1977), pp. 196-202.

¹⁹ This topic is elaborated in two articles: Albert Zimmermann, 'Thomas von Aquin und Siger von Brabant im Licht neuer Quellentexte', in *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter. Festschrift für Karl Langosch zum 70. Geburtstag*, Hrsg. von A. Önnersfors, J. Rathofer, F. Wagner (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), pp. 417-47; Zimmermann, 'Dante hatte doch recht. Neue Ergebnisse der Forschung über Siger von Brabant', in *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, 75 (1967/68), 206-17.

without any clear guidelines as to their use, Zimmermann entitled his work with a question: *Ontologie oder Metaphysik?* The monograph was published in 1965 and the second edition came out in 1998²⁰. The second edition includes a longer introduction and an updated bibliography. To the ten manuscripts included in the first edition, another one was added in the second edition, the manuscript of Richard Rufus of Cornwall. The new edition also contains the views of Robert Kilwardby and identifies two authors of texts previously labeled as anonymous. The two authors are Francis of Marchia and Richard of Clive. The conclusion continues to be the same in both editions despite the thirty-three year gap in between.

The study centers on the determining object (*das bestimmende Worüber*, or *subiectum*) of Metaphysics, considered to be crucial in ascertaining its epistemological status, its content and its methodology. Zimmermann is aware of the modern definition of Metaphysics given by Baumgarten which has its origins in Wolff's divisions of Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology and Natural Theology. He is also attentive to the modern critique of the purported limitations of the content of scholastic Metaphysics. This latter view is derived from Suarez who considered God and the other spiritual substances to be the *obiectum adaequatum* of Metaphysics. The unedited commentaries gave Zimmermann clues as to the existence of an important discussion in the Middle Ages regarding the object of Metaphysics. This led him to posit the hypothesis that there was a mistaken reception of the medieval tradition influenced by Enlightenment ideas. He wanted to focus on a specific aspect of this medieval question. In what way is God the object of Metaphysics? This question presupposed the reception of the Aristotelian tradition on the part of medieval Christian thinkers. What was the place of the Aristotelian "divine science" in the scientific system of the Middle Ages? Was this science absorbed into the science of Theology or did it belong to Metaphysics? If it were the latter case, how was it related to Metaphysics? The Aristotelian reception on this point was not unanimous. There were different views depending on the interpretations given by Boethius, Avicenna and Averroes²¹. Thus, it is not surprising that many Christian thinkers would have divergent ideas on this topic.

After presenting the manuscripts and their corresponding critical texts, Zimmermann looks at the contributions of the principal thinkers during the period ca. 1250 – ca. 1350, a significant moment for the development of Metaphysics, keeping in mind the reception of the *corpus aristotelicum*, the translations from the original Greek and the different attitudes towards these new sources. He analyzes the notions of *subiectum* and of *scientia* in each author. His analysis of God as object of Metaphysics offers three solutions. First, God is one of the several objects of Metaphysics (Roger Bacon, Egidius Romanus, and others). Second, God is the cause of the object of Metaphysics (St. Albert the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas, Richard Rufus). Third, God is part of the object of Metaphysics (Robert Kilwardby, Siger of Brabant, Henry of Ghent). The subsequent commentaries in the 14th century follow these three lines. Among those who consider God as one of the several objects of Metaphysics are: Petrus Aureoli, William of Ockham and John Buridan. The second line is supported by Francis of Marchia and others. The view that God is part of the object of Metaphysics is held by Augustinus Triumphus, John Duns Scotus, and others.

²⁰ See footnote 6 for publication details. The version used in this article is the second edition.

²¹ Zimmermann, *Ontologie oder Metaphysik?*, p. 154.

Zimmermann's conclusive synthesis identifies Metaphysics as a science with a fixed and legitimate place in a complete system of knowledge. It is a single science and its determining object is being as such. In modern terms, it is Ontology. During that time, Natural Theology did not exist as an independent philosophical science. There is however an isolated case of Aristotelian interpretation in the 14th century. Francis of Marchia made a distinction between general Metaphysics which deals with being, and special Metaphysics, sub-alternated to the former, which deals with God as Cause of being. So, he still upheld the unity of Metaphysics, although his solution would lead to the division of Metaphysics, and consequently to the problem of the natural knowledge of God²².

Aristotelian metaphysics presented an onto-theological problem for Christian thinkers. According to Zimmermann, two solutions are possible: 1) God as the Highest Being belongs to the object of Metaphysics. This is the most common solution albeit not the only one. 2) Metaphysics is the "theology of philosophers" insofar as it can arrive at the Cause of its object which is being as such. However, God as such, remains outside the scope of Metaphysics. This second solution is the view held by St. Thomas Aquinas on the grounds of absolute causality and the analogical unity of being. If the analogical unity of being is not taken into account and God is considered to be part of the object of Metaphysics, as in Siger's case, the implications would be: either being is considered in a univocal sense, e.g., Duns Scotus; or being is a term that names in an external way two distinct notions, that of God and created being. This second possibility is the "terminist" solution given by Ockham.

The medieval philosophers had given two fundamental solutions regarding the relationship of God with Metaphysics. Hence, philosophers had to choose between two projects inherited from the Middle Ages while at the same time confront the *Grundfrage* which Heidegger expresses in the following question: Why is there something and not nothing? This question has been posed by Siger, using similar terms, in his critique of the Thomist solution, but Siger dismissed this question as meaningless. Zimmermann, however, thinks that this question, understood as a quest for meaning, is in keeping with St. Thomas' thought. For St. Thomas, this is the most important metaphysical question and is crucial for the whole of philosophy. Notwithstanding the same religious conviction that unites the medieval Christian thinkers, there exist deep differences among them with respect to being as the object of Metaphysics. Zimmermann points out that this fact should be kept in mind by critics of medieval philosophy who view it as an erroneous philosophy. Supported by this and by his other studies, Zimmermann criticizes the commonplace statements that disqualify medieval philosophy and he debunks the Enlightenment opinions about the "dark" Middle Ages (*das finstere Mittelalter*).

Zimmermann was also greatly interested in medieval Physics and compares it with the discoveries of modern Physics. Being knowledgeable in both fields, he is able to question the certainty of some scientific positions, exposing the hypothetical character of some affirmations held to be incontrovertible. For example, he points out that despite the advanced methods employed, our knowledge of the cosmos is

²² Zimmermann writes on this topic in his article: 'Allgemeine Metaphysik und Teilmetaphysik nach einem anonymen Kommentar zur aristotelischen Ersten Philosophie aus dem 14. Jahrhundert', in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 48 (1996), 190-206. In this article, Francis of Marchia was still unidentified as its author.

limited, given that the magnitude and velocity of the universe's expansion do not guarantee that the constants we now observe continue to be valid at the moment of data gathering. If modern science itself cannot do without some hypotheses, neither can it qualify medieval cosmology as something fantastic, especially if it is ignorant of it. Zimmermann claims that we can only arrive at probable answers to the great questions regarding the cosmos and that we do not really know much more than the ancient thinkers even if we may have "more data"²³.

With respect to the intellectual problems in the University of Paris during the latter part of the 13th century, Zimmermann is aware of the historical and philosophical-theological importance of the 1277 censures issuing from ecclesiastical authorities. He personally studied and pushed for the study of these events and their effects on medieval thinkers²⁴. Going beyond the circumstantial and historical character of some of the censored theses, Zimmermann emphasizes their relevance in the contemporary world inasmuch as they reflect the anxieties of the human spirit²⁵. He has undertaken several studies on "Latin Averroism" in the context of these censures. In these works, he pays close attention to Ferrandus of Spain, an Averroist scholar hardly known by medievalists, a defender of the Averroist interpretation of Aristotle and at the same time a Christian believer. Reflecting the Parisian attitude at that time, Ferrandus openly criticized the Thomist interpretation of Aristotle²⁶.

In relation to the clash between Parisian Aristotelianism and Christian doctrine, Zimmermann also takes up the great medieval issue of the "world's eternity," going beyond the circumstantial aspects of the debate. In his study of the irreconcilable positions of St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas on this question, he discovers a basic philosophical problem. St. Bonaventure considers that a world without a beginning is impossible. For St. Bonaventure, possible is what is comprehensible, i.e., measurable by the human mind. St. Thomas, on the other hand, thinks otherwise. He does not consider impossible a world whose past duration is inaccessible to human measuring. While the human spirit certainly looks for what is measurable and tends to identify possibility with measurability, St. Thomas's argument is based on the

²³ On this score, see Zimmermann's following articles: 'Universum, Materie, Raum. Moderne Kosmologie und alte Naturphilosophie', in *Raum und Raumvorstellungen im Mittelalter*, hrsg. von Jan Aertsen und Andreas Speer (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter ["Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 25], 1998), pp. 3-16.

²⁴ See for example: *Die Auseinandersetzungen an der Pariser Universität im XIII. Jahrhundert*, hrsg. von Albert Zimmermann (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter ["Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 10], 1976).

²⁵ Some of these theses are mentioned in: Zimmermann, *Thomas lesen*, pp. 11-12.

²⁶ The articles on Ferrandus which are not included in W. Klatt's list (footnote 11) are: Albert Zimmermann, 'Averroes im Werk des Magisters Ferrandus de Hispania', in *Averroes (1126-1198) oder der Triumph des Rationalismus. Internationales Symposium anlässlich des 800. Todestages des islamischen Philosophen. Heidelberg, 1.-11. Oktober 1998*, hrsg. von R.G. Khoury (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 2002), pp. 297-306; Zimmermann, 'Ferrandus de Hispania – Ein spanischer Gelehrter und Patriot aus dem 13. Jahrhundert', in *Pensamiento medieval hispano. Homenaje a Horacio Santiago-Otero*, ed. by José María Soto Rábanos (Madrid: CSIC, 1998), pp. 1067-80; 'Ferrandus Hispanus – ein Verteidiger des Averroes', in *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277. Philosophie und Theologie an der Universität von Paris im letzten Viertel des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter ["Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 28], 2001), pp. 410-16; 'Remarques et questions relatives à l'oeuvre de Ferrand d'Espagne', in *Diálogo filosófico-religioso entre cristianismo, judaísmo e islamismo durante la Edad Media en la Península Ibérica. Actes du Colloque international de San Lorenzo de El Escorial 23-26 juin 1991 organisé par la Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale*, ed. by Horacio Santiago-Otero (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994), pp. 213-28.

criterion that what is comprehensible for us is not necessarily identical with what is possible in itself²⁷.

Zimmermann carried out thorough studies on the philosophy of nature before and after the reception of the *libri naturales*. In the course of his research, he discovered in Thierry de Chartres' treatise on the *hexaemeron* some arguments in favor of a natural evolution according to the laws of matter (*secundum physicam*), but without applying it yet to the origin of the human species²⁸. He detected a certain critical attitude towards ancient cosmogony already present in the 12th century and more openly in the 13th and 14th centuries. He pointed out the new contributions to the study of nature and the increasing use of mathematics which presaged the theories of Copernicus and Galileo²⁹. In this same context, he also analyzed the contributions of medieval physics to modern thought with respect to measure and number.³⁰ He examined the different positions in medieval discussions of the relationship between philosophy of nature and theology, comparing the radical view of Boethius of Dacia and the views of St. Albert and St. Thomas who defended the distinction and harmony of the two disciplines. He wanted to show that the problem of the relationship between faith and science was already present in the Middle Ages and that there was a convergence among the various given solutions³¹. Zimmermann shows in these studies his conviction that the natural sciences, if undertaken with great care, are not opposed to the existence of God, nor to religion and philosophy. Moreover, he affirms that the serious study of the cosmos is the first step towards philosophizing and in addressing the question of the existence of God. While still a student, Zimmermann had discussed this matter with Wolfgang Kluxen in the presence of Koch, their professor. Kluxen was of the opinion that the origin of philosophizing was ethics³².

To comment on all of Zimmermann's works lies beyond the scope of this article. What I can conclude though is that he took medieval philosophy seriously probably because he took philosophy as such seriously. His work focuses on medieval thought within the framework of the whole of philosophy. His defence of medieval thinkers by means of direct study represents a valid response to voices which seek to discredit the Medieval period, voices such as the Enlightenment position of the *Selbstdenker*. These critical views are mainly due to a lack of knowledge of sources or

²⁷ 'Mundus est aeternus. Zur Auslegung dieser These bei Bonaventura und Thomas von Aquin', in *Die Auseinandersetzungen an der Pariser Universität im XIII. Jahrhundert*, pp. 317-30. These studies are followed by Zimmermann's analysis of the views of St. Bonaventure, St. Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas: 'Alberts Kritik an einem Argument für den Anfang der Welt', in *Albert der Große*, hrsg. von Albert Zimmermann (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter ["Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 14], 1980), pp. 78-88.

²⁸ Albert Zimmermann, 'Die Kosmogonie des Thierry von Chartres', in *Architectura Poetica. Festschrift für Johannes Rathofer zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von U. Ernst und B. Sowinski (Köln-Wien: Böhlau ["Kölner germanistische Studien", 30], 1990), pp. 107-18.

²⁹ Cf. Albert Zimmermann, 'Grundfragen mittelalterlicher Naturphilosophie', in *System und Struktur*, III/2 (Cuxhaven-Dartford: Junghans, 1995), pp. 301-16.

³⁰ Albert Zimmermann, 'Maß und Zahl im philosophischen Denken des Mittelalters', in *Die historische Metrologie in den Wissenschaften*, hrsg. von H. Witthöft u.a. (St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag, 1986), pp. 7-18.

³¹ Albert Zimmermann, 'Naturalis creationem considerare non potest. Überlegungen zur modernen und mittelalterlichen Naturphilosophie', in *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales*, 64/2 (1997), 420-36. Zimmermann, 'Die Theologie und die Wissenschaften', in *Die Renaissance der Wissenschaften im 12. Jahrhundert*, hrsg. von P. Weimar (Zürich-München: Artemis Verlag, 1981), pp. 87-105.

³² Reinhardt, 568.

to historical prejudices. In answer to these objections, Zimmermann proves that medieval thinkers are not lacking in scientific quality and critical capacity with respect to their sources. They had a real *scientia demonstrativa* and *scientia iudicativa*. They confronted the fundamental philosophical questions, e.g., the question of truth, with due seriousness. These are themes which Zimmermann addressed particularly in the latter years of his work³³.

Andreas Speer has pointed out the significance of Zimmermann's forceful criticism against those who view medieval philosophy with contempt and who posit the discontinuity between pre-medieval and post-medieval philosophy. Mindful of this historical reductionism and the uncritical postulate of a general philosophical progress, Zimmermann emphasizes the constant presence of the fundamental philosophical questions that have arisen in different contexts. It is precisely the contextual variety that reveals the continuity of these questions. He defends the enduring importance of medieval philosophy for contemporary philosophical discussion. Thus, his position contrasts with a tendency common to several medievalists, that of focusing only on certain aspects of the medieval period, disregarding its relationship to what is permanent and actual. According to Speer, Zimmermann's works confirm the need for both the philosophical and the historical aspects in the study of texts which allow us to discern the importance of medieval discussions. Without these two aspects, the problem of the Middle Ages would remain incomprehensible³⁴.

The dignity of the person is another constant theme in Zimmermann. He examines the fundamental questions posed by human beings in the context of their time. These are questions arising from the undeniable human tendency to search for the truth. From this standpoint, he dialogues with modern and contemporary thinkers. He extracts basic teachings from medieval thinkers and proves their atemporal validity. These ideas also serve to criticize some modern and post-modern approaches that lead to the relativization and manipulation of the person. His main concerns are: the meaning of human existence vis-à-vis nihilism, the relationship of human beings with nature and their place in the cosmos, the question regarding origin, human freedom and responsibility in the world, and openness towards transcendence in human creatures³⁵. His interest in philosophical anthropology is close-

³³ Albert Zimmermann, "Selbstdenken" – Kennzeichen der Neuzeit? Über ein Leitwort der sogenannten Aufklärung', in *Staatsphilosophie und Rechtspolitik. Festschrift für Martin Kriele zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von B. Ziemse et al. (München: Beck, 1998), pp. 859-73. Albert Zimmermann, 'Philosophie im Mittelalter und Selbstdenken in der Neuzeit', in *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, XXXIV (2001), 207-11.

³⁴ Cf. Andreas Speer, *Scientia und ars im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, "Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 22/1, pp. 8-10. This double volume contains the 22nd meeting of the Kölner Mediaevistentagung of 1992. It examines the change and the continuity between the Middle Ages and the Modern period with respect to its understanding of *scientia*. It examines all the sciences as well as the theory of science.

³⁵ A synthesis of these reflections can be found in a conference delivered by Zimmermann in one of the latest SIEPM congresses: Albert Zimmermann, 'Die Ungeborgenheit des Menschen und die Philosophie', in *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter? Akten des X. Internationalen Kongresses für mittelalterliche Philosophie der SIEPM*, 25.-30. August 1997 in Erfurt, hrsg. von Jan Aertsen und Andreas Speer (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter ["Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 26], 1998), pp. 3-14.

ly related to his commitment to the continuing formation of secondary school teachers³⁶.

Disciples and Influence

Zimmermann's influence is especially evident in his 26-year stay as director of the Thomas-Institut of the University of Cologne. Many students and young academics from different countries benefited enormously from his presence. The biennial gathering of medievalists (*Kölner Mediaevistentagungen*) also provided a venue for inter-disciplinary dialogue between experts and young scholars who were starting their career in medieval studies. Zimmermann's students include, among others, Klaus Jacobi, at present ordinary professor at the University of Freiburg (Germany); Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg who taught at the University of Cologne and who untimely died in 1996; Andreas Speer, currently ordinary professor at the University of Würzburg, recently ordinary professor at the University of Cologne and director of the Thomas-Institut, succeeding Prof. Jean A. Aertsen upon his retirement. Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg praises Zimmermann's qualities as director of important research projects and as a university professor. She recalls his talent for encouraging his students to have an interest in medieval philosophy, teaching them to work in a scientific way, and coaching them to be fearless in confronting difficult questions³⁷. Klaus Jacobi narrates his impressions of what occurred in a seminar on some texts of St. Thomas. While commenting on q. 5 of *In Boethium de Trinitate*, Zimmermann suddenly asked his students: "Ladies and gentlemen, is it really true what St. Thomas is saying here? Unaccustomed to this type of question, his students were taken by surprise. Jacobi felt "shocked" by the question although he was not scandalized by it. He rather sensed a certain relief upon re-discovering this kind of approach which had been discredited in his earlier studies and which he hesitatingly discarded at that time³⁸.

One of Zimmermann's principal convictions is the question of truth. He discovered this question in St. Thomas' commentary to *De caelo et mundo*, formulated in the following way: philosophy searches not what philosophers have thought but searches for the truth of things³⁹. Zimmermann considers this as the *Leitfaden* of the Thomas-Institut, a "guiding" idea which he imbibed from his contact with his predecessors, Josef Koch and Paul Wilpert. Judging from the results of the Thomas-Institut, one can say that the scientific endeavor of this institution consists in carefully

³⁶ Albert Zimmermann, 'La valeur de la personne comme norme de la société dans la pensée médiévale', in *Veritas*, 150 (1993), pp. 181-190. Albert Zimmermann, 'Zur Herkunft der Idee der Menschenwürde', in *Aufklärung durch Tradition: Symposium der Josef Pieper Stiftung zum 90. Geburtstag von Josef Pieper, Mai 1994 in Münster*, Hrsg. Von H. Fechttrup, F. Schulze, T. Sternberg (Münster: Lit Verlag ["Dokumentationen der Josef Pieper Stiftung", 1], 1995), pp. 73-83; Albert Zimmermann, *Wahrheit und Freiheit – gegensätzliche Ziele in der Erziehung?* (Köln: Adamas-Verlag, 1996). These are some of his recent publications on this topic.

³⁷ Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg, *Scientia und ars im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, "Miscellanea Mediaevalia", 22/1, pp. XII-XIII.

³⁸ Klaus Jacobi, 'Der disputative Charakter des scholastischen Philosophierens', in *Philosophie und geistiges Erbe des Mittelalters* (Winksele: Peeters, 1994), pp. 31-2.

³⁹ *In De Caelo et mundo*, I, 1, 22, ed. Marietti, n. 228.

studying the thought and teachings of the medieval thinkers, keeping in mind their inspiring idea of the search for the truth of things. Only by following this same criterion can the scholar do justice to these thinkers⁴⁰. This conviction is specifically reflected in the “fundamental questions” (*Grundfragen*) often posed by Zimmermann in his historico-critical studies. These fundamental questions are likewise questions of meaning (*Sinnfragen*).

Chronology

- 1928. Born in Bergheim/Erft, near Cologne (Germany)
- 1946-1948. Studies of Philosophy at the Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule Sankt Georgen, located at that time in Limburg /Lahn (currently, Frankfurt/Main)
- 1948-1952. Studies of Mathematics and Physics at the Universities of Bonn and Cologne
- 1954. State examination and start of his activity as a high school teacher in Cologne
- 1955. PhD at the University of Cologne with dissertation directed by Josef Koch
- 1957-1960. Post-doctoral research activity in Oxford, Cambridge, London, Paris
- 1960. Presentation of his habilitation paper *Ontologie oder Metaphysik? Die Diskussion über den Gegenstand der Metaphysik im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert* at the University of Cologne where, in 1961, he obtained the *venia legendi* in Philosophy
- 1964. Assistant Professor at the University of Cologne
- 1966-1967. Ordinary Professor at the Pädagogische Hochschule in Siegen (currently, University of Siegen)
- 1967. Successor of Paul Wilpert, both as Ordinary Professor of Philosophy at the University of Cologne, and as director of the Thomas Institut within the same University, holding both positions until 1993
- 1992-1997. President of the SIEPM (Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale), to which he belongs since 1958
- 1993. Retirement from the chair of Philosophy and the direction of the Thomas Institut
- 1993. Grant of the 'Order of Saint Gregory' as recognition of his extra-academic activity (1970-1993) as scientific director of the Institut für Lehrerfortbildung, a Westphalian interdiocesan foundation of the Catholic Church for the continuing formation of high school teachers
- 1999. Ordinary Member of the Pontificia Accademia di San Tommaso d'Aquino, Rome.

Selected Bibliography

1. Books

- Ontologie oder Metaphysik? Die Diskussion über den Gegenstand der Metaphysik im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert. Texte und Untersuchungen* (Leiden-Köln: Brill ['Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters', 8], 1965); 2nd. ed. enlarged (Leuven: Peeters, 1998).
- Ein Kommentar zur Physik des Aristoteles. Aus der Pariser Artistenfakultät um 1273* (Berlin: Gruyter ['Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie', 11], 1968).
- Verzeichnis ungedruckter Kommentare zur Metaphysik und Physik des Aristoteles. Aus der Zeit von etwa 1250-1350*, vol. 1 (Leiden-Köln: Brill ['Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters', 9], 1971).

⁴⁰ Cf. Zimmermann, 'Staunen, vertrauen, lernen – Student am Thomas-Institut', in *Ende und Vollendung. Eschatologische Perspektiven im Mittelalter* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), pp. 34-5.

Der Mensch in der modernen Philosophie (Essen: Ludgerus ['Christliche Strukturen in der modernen Welt', 14], 1975).

Thomas lesen (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt: Frommann-Holzboog ['Legenda', 2], 2000).

2. Editions

Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem/Averrois Opera, Editioni curandae praesident Albertus Zimmermann u.a. (Leuven, Madrid, Jerusalem etc. [Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi], 1983 sqq.).

Meister Eckhart, *Die deutschen und lateinischen Werke: Die lateinischen Werke*, ed. by Albert Zimmermann and Loris Sturlese (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992-1994).

Miscellanea Mediaevalia, vols. 7-22 (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1970-1992).

Albertus Magnus – Doctor Universalis 1280/1980, hrsg. von Gebert Meyer und Albert Zimmermann (Mainz: Grünewald ['Walberger Studien, Philosophische Reihe', 6], 1980).

3. Articles

This is a selection of a few articles representing the different fields of medieval philosophy cultivated by Albert Zimmermann. For a complete list until his retirement in 1993, see the *curriculum operum* by Wolfram Klatt, *Scientia und ars im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, ed. by Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg and Andreas Speer (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter ['Miscellanea Mediaevalia', 22/1], 1994), pp. xxiii-xxx.

'Der Begriff der Freiheit nach Thomas von Aquin', in *Thomas von Aquin 1274/1974*, ed. by Ludger Oeing-Hanhoff (München: Kösel, 1974), pp. 125-59.

'Mundus est aeternus'. Zur Auslegung dieser These bei Bonaventura und Thomas von Aquin', in *Die Auseinandersetzungen an der Pariser Universität im XIII. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Albert Zimmermann (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter ['Miscellanea Mediaevalia', 10], 1976), pp. 317-30.

'Albertus Magnus und der lateinische Averroismus', in *Albertus Magnus – Doctor Universalis 1280/1980*, ed. by Gerbert Meyer and Albert Zimmermann (Mainz: Grünewald ['Walberger Studien, Philosophische Reihe', 6], 1980), pp. 465-93.

'Die Kosmogonie des Thierry von Chartres', in *Architectura Poetica. Festschrift für Johannes Rathofer zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by Ulrich Ernst and Bernhard Sowinski (Köln-Wien: Böhlau Verlag ['Kölner germanistische Studien', 30], 1990), pp. 107-18.

'Praktische Vernunft und Sittengesetz gemäß Thomas von Aquin und Immanuel Kant', in *Littera Sensus Sententia. Studi in onore del Prof. Clemente J. Vansteenkiste*, ed. by Abelardo Lobato (Milano: Massimo, 1991), pp. 671-82.

'La valeur de la personne comme norme de la société dans la pensée médiévale', *Veritas*, 150 (1993), 181-90.

'Grundfragen mittelalterlicher Naturphilosophie', in *System und Struktur*, ed. by Rainer E. Zimmermann (Cuxhaven-Dartford: Junghans-Verlag, 1995), II/2, pp. 301-16.

'Naturalis creationem considerare non potest'. Überlegungen zur modernen und mittelalterlichen Naturphilosophie', in *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales*, 64/2 (1997), 420-36.

'Universum, Materie, Raum. Moderne Kosmologie und alte Naturphilosophie', in *Raum und Raumvorstellungen im Mittelalter*, ed. by Jan Aertsen and Andreas Speer, (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter ['Miscellanea Mediaevalia', 25], 1998), pp. 3-16.

'Ferrandus de Hispania – Ein spanischer Gelehrter und Patriot aus dem 13. Jahrhundert', in *Pensamiento medieval hispano. Homenaje a Horacio Santiago-Otero*, ed. by José M^a Soto Rábanos (Madrid: CSIC, 1998), pp. 1067-80.

'Selbstdenken'-Kennzeichen der Neuzeit? Über ein Leitwort der sogenannten Aufklärung', in *Staatsphilosophie und Rechtspolitik. Festschrift für Martin Kriele zum 65. Geburtstag*, Burkhardt Ziemke and others (München: Beck, 1998), pp. 859-873.

'Averroes im Werk des Magisters Ferrandus De Hispania', in *Averroes (1126-1198) oder der Triumph des Rationalismus*, ed. by Raif Georges Khoury (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 2002), pp. 297-306.

4. Publications about Albert Zimmermann

Philosophie und geistiges Erbe des Mittelalters, ed. by Jan Aertsen, Klaus Jacobi, Georg Wieland and Rémi Brague (Köln: Peeters, 1994).

Scientia und ars im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter, 2 vols, ed. by Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg and Andreas Speer (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter ['Miscellanea Mediaevalia', 22], 1994).

Elisabeth Reinhardt, 'Conversación en Colonia con Albert Zimmermann', *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia*, 11 (2002), 303-26, republished in the book, *Historiadores que hablan de la historia. Veintidós trayectorias intelectuales*, ed. by Elisabeth Reinhardt (Pamplona: Eunsu, 2002), pp. 542-75.

Conclusion

Martin AURELL

(Université de Poitiers – C.E.S.C.M. – I.U.F.)

L'ouvrage qu'il faut à présent clore contient une vingtaine de portraits de médiévistes du XXe siècle. Chacun d'entre eux a été peint avec brillance, pertinence et minutie. Il ne nous reste donc que le plus facile : composer, à la façon des *Tableaux d'une exposition* (1874) de Moussorgsky, la promenade qui permet de se déplacer de l'un à l'autre portrait de cette riche galerie, en retrouvant le fil qui les unit. Le clair-obscur qui a présidé aux différentes contributions, toujours nuancées et pondérées, risque désormais de s'estomper, puisque la synthèse doit prendre le pas sur l'analyse.

Ce livre est issu d'une rencontre, où une vingtaine de médiévistes ont abandonné provisoirement leur champ habituel d'investigation afin de réfléchir sur la nature de leur travail. Quelques contemporanéistes et historiens de l'historiographie se sont joints à eux. Chacun de ces chercheurs a ainsi pris un de ses pairs du dernier siècle pour point de mire. En décrivant sa vie et son œuvre, il a soulevé des interrogations plus larges sur la médiévistique, ses problématiques, méthodes, acquis, travers et perspectives. Il est, en effet, salutaire pour tout historien de prendre, à l'occasion, un tant soit peu de recul sur son métier pour en faire l'épistémologie. Une telle démarche améliore son travail habituel d'érudition.

Le médiéviste et son identité

À quelques exceptions près, les auteurs de cet ouvrage collectif se considèrent donc des médiévistes eux-mêmes. Comme pour eux, l'identité professionnelle de la plupart des historiens du siècle dernier, qu'ils ont bien voulu nous faire découvrir, est profondément marquée par la fierté d'étudier le Moyen Âge.

Certains de ces médiévistes du XXe siècle abandonnent, pourtant, de façon sporadique leur période de prédilection pour emprunter des chemins de traverse et flâner dans d'autres époques. Pierre Duhem consacre ainsi de solides travaux à Léonard de Vinci, mais il est normal pour cet historien « des sciences » de considérer l'évolution des thèmes et méthodes de la physique au cours des âges, avant et après le Moyen Âge. De même, Martí de Riquer, visite régulièrement le Quichotte, livre moderne s'il en est. Cet historien « de la littérature » revient souvent sur cette œuvre, au sens le plus créateur et poétique du terme, car il considère probablement que sa dimension artistique dépasse les contingences temporelles pour toucher la sensibilité de tout homme, quel que soit son siècle. Il n'en reste pas moins que la médiévistique est le champ d'érudition habituel de Pierre Duhem ou de Martí de Riquer, et que leurs escapades du côté du XVIe siècle relèvent de l'excursus ou de la digression.

Plus troublant, ou peut-être plus stimulant, est le cas des médiévistes qui abolissent de façon consciente barrières chronologiques et identités périodiques. Ils font

figure d'enfants terribles au sein de la tribu des médiévistes, dont l'acharnement à s'ériger en spécialistes périodiques est parfois raillé par leurs collègues¹. Sa carrière durant, Marc Bloch préconisa la méthode régressive, aux termes de laquelle il fallait partir d'un présent, vécu intensément et dont on ne devait jamais vraiment se détacher, pour aller vers le passé; cette démarche transparait clairement dans *Les Caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française* (1931), où le regard du géographe sur le paysage contemporain est le préalable indispensable à la remontée dans le temps. Marc Bloch n'aimait pas, d'ailleurs, qu'on l'appelle «médiéviste», mais «historien»: il corrigea avec fermeté sur ce point la présentation biographique qu'avait rédigée à son endroit l'éditeur de *La Société féodale* (1939-1940)². Jacques Le Goff est vraisemblablement l'héritier d'un tel maître, alors qu'il préconise un Moyen Âge s'étendant jusqu'aux révolutions et industrialisations du XIXe siècle, ou qu'il met en avant l'oralité nous unissant à la période médiévale à travers les traditions du folklore. Inutile d'insister, avec ces deux chercheurs, sur tout ce que la périodisation en cours, déterminée par des catégories académiques ou institutionnelles pas toujours très rigoureuses, a de surannée et de peu opératoire sur le plan scientifique. Quand on sait, en outre, tous les préjugés et toutes les connotations péjoratives que contient l'expression même de Moyen Âge, forgée de toutes pièces à la «Renaissance» pour dire le temps médian ou médiocre de l'entre deux³, les réticences à l'employer se comprennent d'autant mieux.

Le cas d'Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie est également digne de mention, puisque, avec ses quelque deux millions de lecteurs, son *Montaillou, village occitan de 1294 à 1324* (1975) devient le *best seller* absolu de l'historiographie médiévale. Or, cet auteur ayant obtenu son doctorat grâce à une thèse sur les paysans languedociens aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles, période à laquelle il a consacré la plupart de ses travaux, apparaît, dans l'ordonnancement universitaire traditionnel, comme un moderniste au sens étroit du terme. Il évite, en outre, soigneusement dans son *Montaillou*, les mots «Moyen Âge» ou «médiéval», car il place l'histoire de ses clercs, seigneurs, paysans et bergers dans la longue durée d'un temps où les activités et les mentalités ne connaissent guère de changement. De son côté, Jaume Vicens i Vives a su également passer outre aux cadres temporels de l'institution académique. Celui en qui il faut assurément voir le plus novateur des historiens de l'après-guerre et l'introducteur de l'esprit des *Annales* dans la péninsule ibérique était aussi à l'aise parmi les *remences* (serfs catalans) du XVe siècle que parmi les industriels barcelonais au XIXe siècle; ses livres de synthèse, *Notícia de Catalunya* (1954) ou *Aproximación a la historia de España* (1952), parcourent avec entrain les millénaires, depuis la préhistoire jusqu'au milieu du XXe siècle. En définitive, si elle est commode, l'étiquette de «médiéviste» ne convient pas tout à fait à des intellectuels qui tiennent le Moyen Âge pour une notion peu opérante, ou qui embrassent, dans leurs recherches, une large palette chronologique.

Il existe une dernière catégorie rejetant l'appellation médiéviste. Il s'agit de philosophes et de théologiens qui considèrent, en effet, qu'il est plus important de chercher la Vérité, avec majuscule, que la façon dont les hommes du Moyen Âge

¹ Olivier Dumoulin, 'La tribu des médiévistes', *Genèses*, 21 (décembre 1995), p. 120-133.

² O. Dumoulin, *Marc Bloch* (Paris: P-Sciences Po, 2002), p. 84-85.

³ Jacques Heers, *Le Moyen Âge. Une imposture* (Paris: Perrin, 1992).

cherchaient la vérité. Albert Zimmermann ou Clemens Baeumker se situent dans cette perspective. À bien des égards, leur attitude rappelle la démarche des historiens de la science ou de la littérature, voire de l'art (grands absents de notre colloque), dont l'objet Science, Littérature ou Art devient un absolu en soi, échappant, à la manière de la Vérité ou de la Beauté, aux cadres spatio-temporels.

Chacun expérimente au quotidien, dans ses laboratoires de recherche et universités, la difficulté de l'inter-disciplinarité ou la transversalité, notion à la mode certes, mais qui recèle bien des paresse intellectuelle et des ambitions de pouvoir académique. Pourquoi donc ne pas respecter la spécificité disciplinaire? Il est normal qu'un historien de la littérature cherche l'inter-textualité dans un texte, de même qu'un historien tout court essaie d'en tirer des renseignements sur le contexte, les hommes en société qui l'ont fait naître. Dans ce sens, la démarche de Marie-Dominique Chenu est bien plus historique que théologique. Pour cet auteur, en effet, la théologie doit être davantage comprise comme «l'événement salvateur tel qu'il a lieu aujourd'hui», que comme un ensemble de dogmes éternels; seule une herméneutique contextualisée permet, en l'occurrence, de saisir la philosophie de Thomas d'Aquin. Cette position détonne dans le milieu de théologiens et philosophes, convaincus, à juste titre, qu'il existe des vérités atemporelles qui méritent d'être étudiées en tant que telles. Or, la quête de cette sagesse, qui, hier comme aujourd'hui, donne sens à l'existence humaine, progresse considérablement au Moyen Age.

Le médiéviste en son temps

Envisageons dorénavant le problème du temps sous un autre angle d'attaque et soulevons de nouvelles questions. Le médiévisme a-t-il évolué au cours du XXe siècle? Quels sont les changements qui affectent alors la pensée et les méthodes des chercheurs? Décèle-t-on des générations intellectuelles différentes dans leur milieu?

Il est évident que les événements et transformations sociales des cent derniers ans n'ont pu exercer qu'une profonde influence sur notre profession. L'étiquette de «siècle de fer», créée en 1602 par Baronius pour désigner le Xe siècle, le plus central du Moyen Age, pourrait s'appliquer davantage au XXe siècle, où se succèdent partout guerres de destruction massive, camps d'extermination, déportations et actes de terrorisme. La violence d'une telle période dépend étroitement de querelles idéologiques, où le passé médiéval devient l'objet de toutes les manipulations. La récente utilisation de la bataille du champ de merles (1389) dans le cadre du conflit entre la Serbie et le Kosovo est l'un parmi tant d'autres exemples de tout le profit immédiat que les événements historiques peuvent apporter à la propagande militaire.

D'autres lectures du Moyen Age servent à étayer des analyses politiques plus profondes. Au début du XXe siècle, bien des médiévistes font ainsi l'éloge des institutions féodo-vassaliques, dont le legs serait, à leurs yeux, un monde hiérarchique où les rapports d'obéissance et de loyauté assurent l'ordre social. En 1906, Hara Katsurô, professeur à Kyôto, publie un ouvrage sur le temps des *samourais*, qu'il appelle le «Moyen Age», en comparaison de l'Europe. À l'époque de la victoire sur la Russie et de l'industrialisation triomphante, il avance même l'idée que la supé-

riorité du Japon en Asie s'explique justement par cette féodalité à l'occidentale, qui aboutit à la fin d'un pouvoir impérial oppressant et à la montée en puissance d'une catégorie aristocratique de guerriers, porteuse de civilisation. Pour cet historien, industrialisation et succès militaires apportent la caution du bien-fondé d'une étude des institutions féodo-vassaliques médiévales, creuset d'un aristocratie qui assure la suprématie de quelques nations privilégiées.

Il est intéressant de constater comment, *a contrario*, la prétendue absence de féodalité apparaît, pour d'autres pays, comme un rendez-vous manqué avec leur histoire. Le philosophe José Ortega y Gasset, héritier du pessimisme de la génération de 1898, dépitée par la perte des dernières colonies face aux États-Unis, attribue une partie des maux de l'*Espagne invertébrée* (1921) à l'absence médiévale de cette forme d'organisation sociale, assurant ailleurs l'encadrement des masses populaires. Dans son discours nostalgique, l'Espagne de l'individualisme et de l'indiscipline serait entrée en décadence pour avoir raté la chance d'un système féodal posant partout ailleurs les fondations d'une Europe prête à la modernité⁴.

Ce dernier exemple témoigne de l'influence que l'historicisme exerce sur les analyses des intellectuels du début du XXe siècle. Issue de l'idéalisme kantien et hégélien, cette philosophie tient l'histoire comme un guide moral des peuples, qui évitent bien des erreurs par sa connaissance. Elle n'est pas incompatible avec le positivisme d'origine scientiste considérant que, pourvu qu'il soit rigoureusement étudié, le document, source d'où jaillit la vérité, fait connaître les actions humaines telles qu'elles se sont réellement passées. Comme pour l'idéalisme historiciste, c'est en Allemagne qu'on trouve alors les représentants les plus influents de l'école positiviste ou méthodique. Ce pays, qui vient d'achever son unité nationale et d'écraser l'armée autrichienne à Sadowa (1866) et la française à Sedan (1870), sous la conduite de Bismarck, devient le modèle à imiter pour bien des médiévistes. La structure de son séminaire historique et philologique se répand dans les grandes universités d'Europe et des États-Unis.

Au cours des années 1920, cependant, les historiens français semblent susciter une admiration accrue, comme si la victoire de la Grande Guerre leur apportait de la reconnaissance. Le positivisme connaît alors ses heures de gloire à Paris. Il est vite détrôné par l'école des *Annales*. L'année 1929, celle de la fondation de cette revue par Lucien Fèbvre et par Marc Bloch, est d'autant plus significative qu'elle voit la crise du jeudi noir et les bouleversements profonds qu'elle entraîne dans les relations humaines. La sociologie d'Emile Durkheim, dont Marc Bloch admire sincèrement l'œuvre⁵, et l'économie de Simon Keynes sont à l'avenir au cœur des sciences humaines. Les médiévistes en adoptent les méthodes, tout en rejetant de façon polémique l'étroitesse des vues du positivisme. L'événement et le grand personnage cèdent la place à l'acteur social. La problématique l'emporte sur le document et sur le fait, puisque les historiens prennent conscience, pour paraphraser Albert Einstein, que «c'est la théorie seule qui décide ce qui peut être observé».

⁴ Martin Aurell, 'Appréhensions historiographiques de la féodalité anglo-normande et méditerranéenne (XIe-XIIe s.)', *Présence du féodalisme et présent de la féodalité. Actes du colloque de Göttingen (30 juin-1er juillet 2000)*, éd. de N. Fryde, P. Monnet, G. Oexle (Göttingen: V&R, 2002), p. 175-194.

⁵ Robert Leroux, *Histoire et sociologie en France. De l'histoire-science à la sociologie durkheimienne* (Paris: PUF, 1998); Olivier Dumoulin, 16 et 104.

Au lendemain de la Seconde Guerre Mondiale, le prestige dont jouit, parmi les intellectuels occidentaux, le matérialisme historique accroît ces tendances.

Un changement de ton se décèle, toutefois, au cours des années soixante-dix. La date de 1974, souvent retenue pour charnière en raison du choc pétrolier, est trompeuse. Elle ne saurait faire oublier qu'en 1968 des étudiants occidentaux animent une révolution d'autant plus paradoxale aux catégories marxistes traditionnelles que la situation de leurs pays, engagés dans les Trente glorieuses, est prospère; à l'est, l'échec du printemps de Prague atténue la fascination des intellectuels pour l'idéologie marxiste dominante. L'arrivée des dissidents russes sur les plateaux de télévision, le déferlement massif des *boat people* sur la mer de Chine et la connaissance de l'auto-génocide cambodgien font le reste⁶. Ils finiront par jeter un discrédit définitif sur des courants de pensée jusqu'alors prépondérants en historiographie.

L'effervescence du monde intellectuel et la richesse des débats que connaissent alors les sciences humaines, du moins à Paris, est sans précédent. Elle coïncide avec une nouvelle stratégie commerciale des éditeurs, qui font entrer l'ouvrage d'histoire dans le marché des livres à forte consommation⁷. Sur le plan sociologique, le succès auprès du grand public français de *Montaillou* (1975), décrivant à partir d'un registre inquisitorial la vie et les croyances des petites gens d'un village isolé des Pyrénées, n'est pas sans intérêt. Il correspond à de nouvelles sensibilités qui se répandent alors dans notre profession: nostalgie tout écologique envers un monde rural en voie de disparition, retour à la terre préconisé par les mouvements de l'après soixante-huit, regain du régionalisme et prise en compte de la vie privée par les chercheurs universitaires⁸. La réhabilitation de l'événement, naguère bête noire de l'école des *Annales*, par le *Bouvines* (1973) de Georges Duby montre toute la portée de l'ébranlement. L'étiquette «Nouvelle histoire», inventée alors pour désigner ces transformations, n'est certainement pas volée.

Il ne faudrait, toutefois, pas manifester trop d'enthousiasme à l'égard de ce réveil intellectuel, qui présente plutôt les allures d'un chant du cygne. Du moins, les acteurs eux-mêmes de ce renouveau ont vite fait de sombrer dans un pessimisme de bon aloi (ou, au mieux, dans une modestie bienvenue) tandis qu'ils doutent sur le sens et sur la portée de toute recherche historique. Après des décennies d'enthousiasme béat et de croyance au progrès sans fins de la connaissance du passé, une sorte de gueule de bois idéologique semble s'être emparée de la profession autour de l'an 2000⁹. Post-modernisme, déconstructionnisme et *linguistic turn* nous apprennent, pour reprendre l'heureuse expression de l'auteur de l'introduction à ce volume, que le document n'est pas «miroir», mais «mirage». Les positions les plus extrêmes de ce courant, exposées par Hayden White, font même de l'histoire et de la fiction une seule et même chose¹⁰. L'historien devient romancier, le génie en moins et la lourdeur en plus.

⁶ *L'Histoire des intellectuels aujourd'hui*, éd. de M. Leymarie, J.-F. Sirinelli (Paris: PUF, 2003).

⁷ Georges Duby, *L'Histoire continue* (Paris: O. Jacob, 1991), p. 150-151.

⁸ Ph. Joutard, 'L'histoire en sabots', *L'Histoire*, 276 (mai 2003), 64-67.

⁹ Ce pessimisme transparait, par exemple, dans le bilan dressé sur le médiévisme actuel par Alain Guerreau, *L'Avenir d'un passé incertain: quelle histoire du Moyen Age au XXIe siècle ?* (Paris: PUF, 2001).

¹⁰ Voir, en dernier terme, les critiques, fort pertinentes, de Jean Claude Schmitt, *La Conversion d'Hermann le Juif* (Paris: Seuil, 2003), p. 45-47.

Limiter son métier à la seule écriture ne va pas sans conséquences pour la lecture du document. Sa compréhension est devenue impossible, tout comme l'est, aux termes des mêmes philosophies, la communicabilité entre les personnes. Le structuralisme aidant, l'idée prévaut que le texte n'est guère le reflet d'une réalité extramentale, et qu'en conséquence nous ne pouvons, tout au plus, qu'en déconstruire les discours complexes qui l'enferment en lui-même tel un vase clos. Ces nouvelles orientations du métier du médiéviste s'accompagnent d'une vision négative du Moyen Âge, où les élucubrations des clercs (dont les «incompréhensibles» écrits représentent justement notre seule source de connaissance pour la période) ont enfanté le rejet de l'altérité religieuse et appris au tout venant le mépris ethnique. La société persécutrice occidentale naît alors. Nous pâtirions encore des conséquences désastreuses du legs d'une telle intolérance.

Cette perception péjorative de l'époque médiévale semble particulièrement à la page dans l'historiographie des États-Unis. Pourtant, dans les années 1920-1960, les médiévistes américains tournaient avec sympathie leur regard vers la renaissance intellectuelle, vers l'octroi des libertés communales ou vers la genèse de l'État moderne, qu'ils tenaient pour le berceau de leur propre civilisation: *English history is in a sense early American history*, écrivait Charles H. Haskins en 1923¹¹. De nos jours, peu de médiévistes des États-Unis souscriraient à une telle affirmation, qu'ils critiqueraient pour son ethnocentrisme étroit. Après 1968, les chercheurs de ce pays insistent, en effet, davantage sur le côté obscur du Moyen Âge que sur tout ce dont la modernité lui est redevable. Quand ils se penchent sur cette période, leurs sujets d'investigation deviennent l'oppression de la femme, la violence débridée et l'impossible règlement des conflits ou l'étrange, le grotesque et le monstrueux, qu'ils tiennent pour les traits les plus saillants d'un millénaire ayant profondément déformé nos consciences d'Occidentaux¹².

À ce tableau probablement trop sombre, certains communicants de notre colloque ont riposté en faisant valoir quelques philosophes qui, de nos jours, présentent une théorie de la connaissance plus positive. Emmanuel Levinas insiste ainsi sur l'altérité qui, opposé à la subjectivité, permet de sortir de soi pour communiquer; il en résulte une épistémologie aux multiples ouvertures pour le médiéviste, à qu'il n'est plus interdit d'atteindre l'autre médiéval. Loin de succomber aux sirènes de la «narrativité méta-historique», le ton de Paul Ricœur sur la quête du passé historique et sur son expression écrite est aussi optimiste. Somme toute, en dépit de quelques prophètes de malheur, le métier de médiéviste a encore de beaux jours devant lui.

Le médiéviste et la Cité

Au-delà de leur œuvre, les médiévistes apparaissent en tant qu'hommes dans ce volume. Leur biographie y est souvent retracée. Nous avons donc ici affaire à une

¹¹ 'European history and American scholarship', *American Historical Review*, 28, p. 215, cité par Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *The Past as a Text: the Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1998), p. 64.

¹² Paul Freedman, Gabrielle M. Spiegel, «Medievalisms Old and New: The Rediscovery of Alterity in North American Medieval Studies», *The American Historical Review*, 123 (1998), 675-704; G. M. Spiegel, *The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1999).

vingtaine de destinées individuelles qui, mises ensemble, dessinent les contours d'un groupe social d'intellectuels dont il convient de tirer quelques conclusions d'ordre prosopographique. La première qui vient aussitôt à l'esprit est l'absence de femmes parmi les intellectuels étudiés, comme si l'institution académique, extrêmement conformiste, n'avait rien fait, jusqu'aux dernières décennies du XXe siècle, pour rendre compatible carrière universitaire et maternité.

Il est, en outre, frappant de constater que plusieurs médiévistes du XXe siècle ont vécu avec intensité les troubles événements de leur temps. Certains d'entre eux ont même joué un rôle politique de premier plan. En 1919, Charles H. Haskins conseille ainsi le président Wilson au traité de Trianon-Versailles: sa fascination sans bornes pour le monde normand et pour les intellectuels chartrains du XIIe siècle est, sans doute, pour quelque chose dans le règlement, fort avantageux pour la France, du problème de l'Alsace-Lorraine ou de la Sarre. De son côté, François-Louis Ganshof fait partie de la délégation belge à la même conférence de paix, et on n'a guère de mal à imaginer les deux érudits en train de deviser sur le Moyen Age dans la galerie des glaces. Extrêmement datée, la conclusion au plus célèbre des ouvrages historiques de F.-L. Ganshof, fondée sur le présupposé de la supériorité de la civilisation féodale entre Loire et Rhin, sent le discours patriotique aux accents militaristes et à l'humanisme généreux: «N'est-ce pas à la féodalité que remontent le prestige dont jouit le métier des armes, le prix qu'ont encore pour nous des engagements librement consentis, l'idée que l'on n'est pas tenu d'obéir à une contrainte passant les limites de ce qui est compatible avec la dignité de l'homme libre?»¹³ Dans ces deux cas, le diplomate et ses décisions ne sauraient être dissociés du médiéviste.

D'une tout autre nature est l'engagement de Marc Bloch. Officier exemplaire pendant la Première Guerre Mondiale, puis résistant sous l'occupation allemande, fusillé par les nazis en 1944, cet historien a personnellement incarné jusqu'à ses ultimes conséquences sa célèbre devise: «Vivre le présent pour comprendre le passé!». Éprouvée à l'étude des procès-verbaux du couronnement royal, des actes d'affranchissement de serfs ou de terriers et censiers, sa méthode érudite lui ouvre, de façon indiscutable, la compréhension des événements du temps qu'il lui est donné de vivre. Encore de nos jours, son *Etrange défaite* apparaît comme l'une des analyses les plus pénétrantes jamais rédigées sur les causes de la rapide victoire allemande sur la France en 1940. À l'inverse, bien de ses problématiques et questionnements découlent de son expérience vitale: sa réflexion sur la rumeur dans la société médiévale provient, dit-il, de son combat dans les tranchées en 14-18.

La Deuxième Guerre Mondiale a également été fatale à Ugo Sesini ou à Johan Huizinga, qui n'ont pas survécu aux camps de concentration. Elle avait été préparée en Allemagne par des lois anti-sémites provoquant le départ Outre-Atlantique de Roberto S. Lopez (qui demanda qu'on chante l'air des déportés de Babylone du *Nabucco* à ses funérailles), d'Ernst Kantorowicz et d'Ernst Panofski. Enfin, Claudio Sánchez Albornoz, député, ministre et ambassadeur sous la Seconde République Espagnole, puis chef du gouvernement républicain en exil entre 1962 et 1970, a également été contraint d'abandonner son pays. Rappelons, au passage, le discours qu'il prononce, en 1931, devant les *Cortes* espagnoles pour montrer que la *reconquista*

¹³ *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité ?* (Bruxelles: Office de publicité, 1957, 3e ed.), p. 218.

est à l'origine de la seigneurie oppressive et du *latifundium* injuste en Nouvelle Castille et en Andalousie, que la nouvelle réforme agraire devrait se charger d'abolir à jamais.

Ces médiévistes ont donc souffert, dans leur propre chair, les conséquences les plus terribles des conflits de la première moitié du XXe siècle. Leur œuvre historiographique porte les traces de ces avatars, tout comme leur engagement suit l'influence de leurs connaissances érudites et de leur méthode de travail.

Il ne faudrait cependant pas exagérer la portée de l'activité politique des membres de la corporation des médiévistes. La distinction gramscienne entre «intellectuels engagés» et «intellectuels organiques», reprise par Jacques Le Goff pour la période médiévale, peut parfaitement s'appliquer à notre profession, où les seconds semblent, d'ailleurs, l'emporter bien davantage sur les premiers. En effet, l'un des principaux apports institutionnels du XXe siècle à notre science est sa professionnalisation: l'étude du Moyen Âge cesse définitivement d'être passe-temps divertissant de quelques rentiers éclairés pour devenir un métier à part entière. Une transformation si radicale est due à la restructuration de l'Université. Détenteurs de chaires ou de postes dans les organismes publics de recherche, presque tous les intellectuels étudiés ici ont coulé des jours paisibles dans des cabinets, archives et bibliothèques. Ils ont collectionné les honneurs universitaires, et ils se sont cru immortels dans les académies érudites. Leur *cursus honorum* rejoint, en définitive, le paisible déroulement de la carrière la plus institutionnellement reconnue¹⁴. Tout au plus ont-ils senti le souffle de la contestation étudiante de 1968!

Presque sans exception, ils ont, tous, obtenu les chaires dans les plus prestigieuses des universités publiques. La vie centenaire de Ramón Menéndez Pidal ou de Rafael Lapesa semble ainsi avoir emprunté des chemins bien tranquilles. Le premier paraît si immergé dans ses recherches qu'il découvre, à l'occasion des chants interprétés le jour même de ses noces, l'oralité du *Romancero*, ou qu'il puise dans l'épopée castillane, à laquelle il consacre le plus clair de son temps et les meilleures de ses énergies, les prénoms de Jimena et de Gonzalo qu'il donne à ses enfants. Au demeurant, le penseur est presque toujours paralysé dans une activité d'ordre publique par le doute méthodique présidant à sa démarche intellectuelle. La prise, et surtout l'application, des décisions est rarement sa tasse de thé. *A contrario*, le nombre de nos collègues qui, à force d'accepter des tâches administratives, finit par abandonner l'investigation personnelle est trop élevé pour qu'on puisse affirmer que, dans les métiers d'érudition, l'action est à peine compatible avec la réflexion.

Elle se marie rarement avec la rigueur de la recherche documentaire, qui exige du temps et de la continuité dans le travail. Force est ici de revenir sur ce qui est une évidence, pourtant si souvent oubliée: il n'y a pas d'histoire sans source. De nos jours, plusieurs voix se lèvent en faveur d'une «nouvelle érudition», qui serait le pendant de la «nouvelle histoire» des années 1980. Pourvu qu'elle soit ouverte à de larges problématiques, seule une méthode positiviste bien comprise permettra, en effet, à la recherche du XXIe siècle de progresser. Certes, la maxime de Leopold von Ranke («observer les faits tels qu'ils se sont réellement déroulés») paraît, dans sa prétention, bien démodée. Aucun d'entre nous n'aurait, pourtant, pas de mal à souscrire au conseil de Fustel de Coulanges: «une année d'analyse pour un jour de synthèse».

¹⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo academicus* (Paris: Minuit, 1984).

Cette importance accordée à la recherche érudite transparaît dans plusieurs exemples développés dans ce volume. Nous ne retiendrons ici que Ugo Sesini en train de décaper la musique médiévale de ses couches d'interprétation successives, introduisant à la longue un rythme modal erroné. Quoi dire encore de la façon dont Frédérick W. Maitland s'est débarrassé de l'antiquarisme, du constitutionnalisme et du nationalisme qui tenaient, de son temps, le haut du pavé dans l'histoire du droit anglais, afin d'aller trouver dans les sources juridiques et judiciaires originales une interprétation bien plus novatrice de la *Common law* ? Pour être fructueuse, la recherche médiévale demande une haute technicité, souvent interdite à profanes et amateurs.

C'est peut-être pourquoi le monde des médiévistes, peu ouvert à la vie politique et sociale, est si petit. L'ambiance stimulante qui règne à Oxford dans les années 1950, où C.S. Lewis mène ses recherches littéraires, est remarquable par la concentration élevée de spécialistes dans un périmètre extrêmement réduit. Pourvu que les relations humaines ne soient pas trop délétères, les échanges avec d'autres chercheurs, toujours si enrichissants, n'en sont que plus faciles. Inutile de dire que le groupe des médiévistes s'organise d'après des règles, souvent tacites, qu'il partage avec l'ensemble du milieu universitaire. Plusieurs communications ont évoqué, par exemple, l'importance des écoles autour d'un chercheur renommé, capable de former de nombreux disciples et de mener son entourage vers une ligne de pensée ou des méthodes spécifiques. Ces relations entre maîtres et élèves ne doivent pourtant pas être présentées sous un jour exclusivement idyllique. Elles peuvent parfois devenir tendues, que ce soit Œdipe (le fils tuant le père) ou Cronos (le père dévorant ses enfants) qui s'en mêle !

Que la plupart des médiévistes mènent leur quotidien dans un petit monde clos ou qu'ils s'écarterent volontairement de la vie publique n'implique pas qu'ils demeurent indifférents aux combats de leurs contemporains. Ils succombent même souvent à la tentation de l'historicisme¹⁵. Très peu d'années après 1968, Georges Duby conclut son *Bouvines* par les bombardements américains sur Saïgon et par une parade militaire franquiste à Saint-Jacques de Compostelle, qu'il place dans la continuité des violences et idéologies politico-religieuses médiévales décrites dans son ouvrage. Il ne se réclame pas pour rien, lui-même, de la « souplesse conceptuelle »¹⁶. Il apparaît véritablement comme le Picasso des études médiévales, attentif aux courants et modes historiographiques les plus porteurs, mais aussi aux idées politiques en vogue, qu'il sublime génialement dans des ouvrages destinés à perdurer à travers les siècles.

Sa démarche ne saurait être jugée hâtivement comme superficielle. Elle part d'un principe largement répandu parmi les historiens, que résume bien l'impératif catégorique de Marc Bloch, « Vivre le présent », cité plus haut. De façon similaire, Jean-Claude Schmitt dit, sur Jacques Le Goff, qu'il fait un « usage heuristique de l'anachronisme ». Nous sommes ici bien loin de la définition de l'histoire comme science de ce qui n'arrive qu'une seule fois, préconisée par Charles Seignobos, porte-parole attitré du positivisme méthodique, niant tout droit de cité au comparatisme chronologique. Il est normal, et même salubre, d'essayer de connaître

¹⁵ Otto G. Oexle, *L'Historisme en débat. De Nietzsche à Kantorowicz*, (Paris: Aubier, 2001).

¹⁶ Pierre Boucheron, 'Georges Duby', *Les Historiens*, (Paris: A. Colin, 2003), p. 233.

comment les médiévaux ont réagi face à des problèmes qui rappellent, ne serait-ce que de loin, les nôtres. C'est tout naturellement que l'intérêt de Jaume Vicens pour la guerre civile catalane du XVe siècle est éveillé par le conflit de 36-39 qu'il lui est donné de vivre; cette expérience affine ses problématiques, ou du moins élargit-elle la palette des questions qu'il pose aux sources. Elle lui permet de dépasser l'explication surannée du peuple catalan, avide de libertés et nostalgique d'un passé récent prestigieux, se révoltant contre les Trastamares, dynastie que ses origines castillane rendent intransigeante et même oppressive.

Une telle vision des choses se retrouve dans l'œuvre de Ferran Soldevila, dont le catalanisme s'exacerbe, tandis qu'il bat le fer, au sujet du compromis de Caspe de 1412, avec Ramón Menéndez Pidal, porte-parole, quant à lui, de l'espagnolisme¹⁷. Cette polémique n'est pas exceptionnelle dans le contexte intellectuel du XXe siècle, où le nationalisme, engendré au siècle précédent, est à l'origine des plus catastrophiques des conflits. De fait, cette forme dévoyée du patriotisme nous apparaît comme la toile de fond de bien des travaux des médiévistes du XXe siècle¹⁸. Rares sont ceux qui ont eu la clairvoyance de s'en détacher. Les résultats du nationalisme en médiévisique sont doublement ambigus, positifs et négatifs à la fois. Ils ont, d'une part, pu pousser les autorités politiques à la création de chaires universitaires et à encourager études et éditions de textes prouvant l'antiquité de la nation. Mais, d'autre part, ils ont mené bien des chercheurs vers des impasses intellectuelles qui prêtent aujourd'hui à sourire : Damião Peres soutenant les frontières naturelles entre le Portugal et la Castille, François-Louis Ganshof faisant de la Belgique le cœur de l'Empire carolingien, Ramón Menéndez Pidal retrouvant le *Volksgeist* du peuple espagnol dans son réalisme...

À la lecture d'un ouvrage récent, l'on s'aperçoit, en outre, que le nationalisme historiographique n'est pas seulement source d'hypothèses hasardeuses, mais qu'il introduit des modes changeantes et versatiles, au gré des vicissitudes politiques et des relations entre les États¹⁹. Le livre en question porte sur l'image du roi Arthur en Grande Bretagne. Le discours valorisant à l'égard de ce personnage, fort apprécié des savants et des gouvernants anglais de la fin du Moyen Âge, périclité à l'époque moderne. La réforme protestante et l'Église nationale aidant, les Germains deviennent alors, au détriment des Celtes britanniques, les enfants chéris des intellectuels de l'île. Le XIXe siècle victorien hérite d'autant plus d'une telle mentalité historiographique que l'Angleterre est fière de ses institutions constitutionnelles et de son empire colonial, attribué au monde germanique d'où provient la dynastie régnante des Hanovre : Alfred le Grand détrône Arthur de Bretagne. Pourtant, le triomphe de l'Anglo-Saxon sur le Breton n'est pas définitif. Après 1945, tandis que l'Allemagne perd, pour des raisons évidentes, son prestige Outre-Manche, et que le Pays de Galles fait entendre ses revendications, le roi celte, dont l'existence elle-même ne va pas de soi, prend sa revanche parmi les médiévistes. Il se transforme

¹⁷ Sur les différents nationalismes dans l'historiographie espagnole contemporaine, voir Jaume Aurell, 'Historiadores románticos e historiadores científicos en la historiografía catalana contemporánea', *Memoria y Civilización*, 3 (2000), 237-273, et «La formación del imaginario histórico del nacionalismo catalán. De la *Renaixença* al *Noucentisme* (1830-1930)», *Historia Contemporánea*, 22 (2001), 257-288.

¹⁸ Voir, en dernier lieu, Guerreau; Patrick Geary, *The Myth of Nations: the Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton (NJ): Princeton UP, 2002).

¹⁹ Nicholas J. Higham, *King Arthur. Myth-Making and History* (London-New York: Routledge, 2002).

même alors en l'« icône culturelle » de tout un peuple, lecteur assidu de *The Age of Arthur* (1973) de John Morris et passionné pour les résultats des fouilles de Tintagel (Cornouailles). Ces avatars de la légende arthurienne sont à mettre encore sur le dos du nationalisme. Ils montrent toute la fragilité des conclusions de l'historien, prisonnier de son contexte. Ils ne peuvent que pousser le chercheur à davantage de modestie...

Faut-il pour autant finir sur une note négative à propos des historiens du XXe siècle en raison de leur seul nationalisme ? Un tel bilan serait assurément trop injuste. Parmi les multiples acquis qui font de nous autres médiévistes de l'an 2000 des nains juchés sur les épaules des géants du siècle précédent, nous ne retiendrons ici que l'enthousiasme, la passion même, qu'ils ont su manifester pour le Moyen Age. Sans tomber dans une idéalisation naïve de cette époque, les meilleurs d'entre eux ont su l'aimer et la faire aimer, avec ses qualités et ses défauts, de leurs auditeurs et lecteurs. En ce sens, ils ont opéré un retour au romantisme, après plusieurs décennies de distanciation positiviste. Leur enthousiasme ne relève pas du seul sentiment, mais il répond à une exigence épistémologique certaine. Il ne saurait, en tout état de cause, être critiqué par l'anthropologie culturelle en vogue qui prône le respect de l'altérité des hommes, en l'occurrence médiévaux, qu'observe l'historien²⁰.

L'aveu de Jacques Le Goff, s'éprenant du Moyen Age dans son enfance à la lecture de Walter Scott, est significatif de cette nouvelle sensibilité. À l'époque, Charles H. Haskins déplace la « Renaissance » du XVIe au XIIe siècle, où il fait commencer la modernité de la civilisation européenne, que cet Américain admire sincèrement. Ce point de vue n'aurait certainement pas été démenti par C.S. Lewis, défenseur infatigable de la qualité du latin médiéval face au latin de l'humanisme. Un esprit similaire se retrouve chez Pierre Duhem, assurément le plus prolixe des médiévistes du XXe siècle : à le suivre, la révolution scientifique n'a pas eu tant lieu au XVIe qu'au XIVe siècle, où les grands maîtres, libérés de l'aristotélisme par les condamnations parisiennes de 1277, ont adopté la méthode empirique et inductive. Ces idées rappellent Etienne Gilson, pour qui, au Moyen Age, la théologie chrétienne fait progresser considérablement la philosophie : l'originalité théorique de la scolastique est, dès lors, indéniable. Ajoutons, enfin, la révolution copernicienne opérée par Roberto S. Lopez en histoire économique : les Xe et XIe siècles, dit-il, connaissent un progrès commercial sans précédents, alors que le XVIe siècle est une période de déclin... L'admiration de tous ces auteurs pour la période qu'ils étudient, ou du moins la mise en valeur de ses acquis, ne fait pas de doute.

On rétorquera peut-être que le Moyen Age n'a pas toujours été, à leurs yeux, une période de lumière ni de progrès. Cette remarque est juste, car pondération et sens des nuances accompagnent habituellement la réflexion de l'historien équilibré. La vision de l'époque que livre, par exemple, Johan Huizinga est marquée par l'idée de décadence : *tempus senescit* ! Son œuvre a certainement influencé *Le Septième sceau* (1956) d'Ingmar Bergmann, qui met en scène les angoisses existentielles d'un croisé de retour en Occident, dont il perçoit toutes les rigidités, crédulités et intran-

²⁰ Dominique Barthélemy [« Marc Bloch », *Les Historiens* (Paris : A. Colin, 2003), p. 85-103] vient d'épingler, à juste titre, l'approche, parfois peu distanciée, même si elle est le fruit d'une méthode ethnologique balbutiante, avec laquelle M. Bloch attaque les croyances médiévales autour de la royauté, sur lesquelles ce dernier historien se permettait parfois d'émettre des jugements de valeur péjoratifs : « esprits grossiers », « aberrations », « pensée encore peu évoluée », cité Barthélemy, p. 92.

sigeances. Il n'en reste pas moins que l'image de l'«âpre saveur de l'existence», popularisée par Johan Huizinga, répond à la même fascination qu'on retrouve, au début de son siècle, chez les écrivains crépusculaires. L'Automne du titre de son livre sent, en effet, la poésie, quand il n'est pas le prélude d'un printemps et d'un été exceptionnels.

La métaphore mérite d'être filée en médiévistique. Le XXe siècle, avec ses violents bouleversements, ne recèlerait-il pas les prodromes d'un renouveau radical de notre discipline?

Notes on Contributors

JAUME AURELL is Associate Professor of History at the Universidad de Navarra (Spain), and specializes on cultural history and the history of historiography. His recent publications include *La cultura del mercader en la Barcelona del siglo XV* (1998, with Alfons Puigarnau), *La escritura de la memoria. De los positivismos a los postmodernismos* (2005) and he has edited *El Mediterráneo Medieval y Renacentista, espacio de mercados y de culturas* (2002). His articles have appeared in *Journal of Medieval History*, *Viator*, and *Revue Historique*, among others.

MARTIN AURELL is Professor of Medieval History at the Université de Poitiers (Centre d'Etudes Supérieures de Civilisation Médiévale) and Director of the *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*. He works on political history, specially on French, English and Catalan nobility. His current research is on the social and political implications of the Arthurian legends. His publications include *La vielle et l'épée. Troubadours et politique en Provence au XIIIe siècle* (1989), *Les noces du Comte. Mariage et pouvoir en Catalogne (785-1213)* (1995) and *L'empire des Plantagenêt: 1154-1224* (2003).

FRANCISCO J. CASPISTEGUI is Associate Professor of Contemporary History at the Universidad de Navarra. He works on political history and the history of historiography. He has published *El naufragio de las ortodoxias: el carlismo, 1962-1977* (1997), *La nueva historia cultural: la influencia del postestructuralismo y el auge de la interdisciplinariedad* (1996), and *The Strength of History at the Doors of the New Millenium: History and the Other Social and Human Sciences along the 20th Century. (1899-2002)* (2004), both with Ignacio Olábarri.

FRANCISCO CROSAS is Associate Professor of Ancient Spanish Literature at the University of Toledo (Spain), and Secretary of the Federation of Associations of Spanish Teachers (FASPE). He works on the Classical tradition in Medieval culture. His main monographs are *La materia clásica en la poesía de cancionero* (1995) and *De diis gentium* (1998), and he has published critical editions of Medieval and Renaissance texts.

PAUL FREEDMAN is Professor of Medieval History and Department Chair at Yale University. He works on the history of Catalonia, comparative studies of the peasantry and is currently interested in the demand for luxury products, particularly spices. He is the author of *The Diocese of Vic* (1981), *The Origins of Peasant Servitude in Medieval Catalonia* (1991), and *Images of the Medieval Peasant* (1999).

NATALIE FRYDE is Professor of Medieval History at the University of Darmstadt (Germany). Her publications include *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (1979), *Ein mittelalterlicher deutscher Grossunternehmer: Terricus Teutonicus de Colonia in England, 1217-1247* (1997) and *Why Magna Carta? Angevin England Revisited* (2001).

ALESSANDRO GHISALBERTI is Professor of the History of Medieval Philosophy at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (Milan – Italy). He is Director of the Department of Philosophy and of *Rivista di Filosofia neo-Scolastica*. He has published *Guglielmo di Ockham* (1972), *Giovanni Buridano dalla metafisica alla fisica* (1975), *Medioevo teologico. Categorie della teologia razionale nel Medioevo* (1990), and *La filosofia medievale* (2002).

ÁNGEL GÓMEZ MORENO is Professor of Spanish Literature at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. He specializes in Medieval and early Renaissance Literatures of the Iberian Peninsula. He is author or co-author of *Bibliography of Old Spanish Texts* (1984, 1992, 1999), *Historia Crítica de la Literatura Hispánica* (1987, 1988, 1991), editions of Santillana (2003), Mena (1994) and Manrique (2000), *El teatro medieval castellano en su marco románico* (1991), *España y la Italia de los humanistas: primeros ecos* (1994),

DIRK HEIRBAUT is Professor of History of Law at the Université de Ghent (Belgium). He is currently doing research on the legal history of medieval Flanders and the development of 19th Century Belgian law. He has written *Over heren, vazallen en graven. Het persoonlijk leenrecht in Vlaanderen, ca. 1000-1305* (1997) and *Over lenen en families. Een studie over de vroegste geschiedenis van het zakelijk leenrecht in het graafschap Vlaanderen* (2000).

JOSÉ-LUIS MARTÍN, who passed away in 2004, was Professor of Spanish Medieval History at the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (Spain). His publications include *Orígenes de la Orden Militar de Santiago (1170-1195)* (1974), *Evolución económica de la Península Ibérica (siglos VI-XIII)* (1976) and *Enrique IV de Castilla: rey de Navarra, príncipe de Cataluña* (2003).

ANICETO MASFERRER is Professor of Legal History at the Universitat de València (Spain). He works on the history of criminal law, specially on the Spanish, French, German and English traditions. His publications include *La pena de infamia en el Derecho histórico español. Contribución al estudio de la tradición penal europea en el marco del ius commune* (2001) and *Tradición y reformismo en la Codificación penal española* (2003).

MASSIMO MASTROGREGORI is Professor of Contemporary History (History of Historiography) at the Università di Roma "La Sapienza" and General Editor of "Storiografia" and of "International bibliography of historical sciences". He works on historiography and cultural history, especially on European historians and thinkers in the XXth century. He has published *Il genio dello storico* (1987), *Il manoscritto interrotto di Marc Bloch* (1996), *Introduzione a Bloch* (2001); he also edited *La recensione* (1997) and *Il potere dei ricordi* (1998).

MICHAEL McVAUGH is William Smith Wells Professor of History at the University of North Carolina. His current research is on the history of medicine and science in the Middle Ages, and he is one of the general editors of the *Arnaldi de Villanova Opera Medica Omnia* (1975-). His publications include *Medicine before the*

Plague: Practitioners and their Patients in the Crown of Aragon 1285-1345 (1993), and a critical edition of the *Inventarium sive Chirurgia magna* of Guy de Chauliac (1997).

JULIA PAVÓN is Associate Professor of Medieval History at the University of Navarra (Spain). Her recent publications include *Poblamiento altomedieval navarro* (2001) and *Ante la muerte. Actitudes, espacios y formas en la España medieval* (co-edited with Jaume Aurell, 2002). Her research interests are the political and social aspects of Medieval History of Navarre and Spain. She is currently preparing a critical edition of the unpublished texts on the Hospitaliar Order of Saint John of Jerusalem in Medieval Navarre.

MIGUEL ANGEL PÉREZ PRIEGO is Professor of History of Literature at the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (Spain). His publications include *Laberinto de fortuna: Poemas menores / Juan de Mena* (1976), *El teatro de Diego Sánchez de Badajoz* (1982) and *Cuatro comedias celestinescas* (1993).

ENRIC PUJOL has published *El descredit de la Historia* (1993), *Ferran Soldevila. Els fonaments de la historiografia catalana contemporània* (1995) and *Història i Reconstrucció Nacional. La historiografia catalana a l'època de Ferran Soldevila (1894-1971)* (2004).

ELISABETH REINHARDT is Associate Professor of Medieval Theology at the Universidad de Navarra. She works on the 12th and 13th centuries and is a member of a research team on Neoplatonism and causality in the 12th century. She is the editor of *Tempus implendi promissa, Homenaje al Prof. Dr. Domingo Ramos-Lissón* (2000), *Historiadores que hablan de la historia. Veintidós trayectorias intelectuales* (2002), and *Nociones de antropología tomasiana* (forthcoming).

ANTONI ROSSELL is Professor of Medieval Philology at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (Institut d'Estudis Medievals) and Director of the Arxiu Occità. He works on literature and music, particularly Occitan, French and Galician. His publications include *El Cant dels Trobadors* (1992), *La lírica galego-portugues* (2003), *Literatura i Música a l'Edat Mitjana: la cançó èpica* (2004) and *Literatura i Música a l'Edat Mitjana: lírica* (2004).

JOSE ENRIQUE RUIZ-DOMÈNEC is Professor of Medieval History at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. He is Director of the Institut d'Estudis Medievals and of the Departament de Ciències de l'Antiquitat i de la Edat Mitjana. He works on social history, specially on chivalry, women's history and Mediterranean culture. He has published *El Gran Capitán. Retrato de una época* (2000), *Ricard Guillem, un sogno per Barcellona* (1999); *Rostros de la Historia. Veintún historiadores para el siglo XXI* (2000) and *Palestina, pasos perdidos* (2004).

JOSEP-IGNASI SARANYANA is Professor of History of Theology at the Universidad de Navarra (Spain) and Editor of *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia*. His current research focuses on History of Medieval and Renaissance Philosophy, and the History of Latin American Theology. He is the author of *Teología de la mujer, teología feminista, teología mujerista y ecofeminismo en América Latina (1975-2000)* (2001),

La filosofía medieval. Desde sus orígenes patristicos hasta la Escolástica barroca (2003), *Filosofía y teología en el Mediterráneo occidental (1263-1490)* (2003) and *Cien años de Teología en América Latina (1899-2001)* (2005).

JEAN-CLAUDE SCHMITT is Director of Studies at the École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales à Paris. He teaches social and cultural history of the Middle Ages. Publications: *La raison des gestes dans l'Occident médiéval* (1990), *Les revenants. Les vivants et les morts dans la société médiévale* (1994), *Le corps, les rites, les rêves, le temps. Essais d'anthropologie médiévale* (2001), *Le corps des images. Essais sur la culture visuelle du Moyen Age* (2002), *La conversion d'Hermann le Juif. Autobiographie, histoire et fiction*, (2003).

MARÍA-JESÚS SOTO-BRUNA is Professor of History of Medieval Philosophy at the Universidad de Navarra (Spain) and Director of the Institute of Medieval Studies. Her research has centered on the Metaphysics of Neo-Platonism and she has published *La recomposición del espejo* (1995), *La metafísica del infinito en G. Bruno* (1997), a critical edition of Dominicus Gundissalinus' treatise on "De procesione mundi" (1999, coedited with Concepción Alonso del Real) and has also translated into Spanish and edited the "De Veritate" of Thomas Aquinas.

MARTIN THURNER is currently private lecturer of Christian Philosophy at the Martin Grabmann Research Institute in Medieval Theology and Philosophy (University of Munich). His main research fields are ancient and medieval philosophy, with emphasis on anthropology, Thomas Aquinas, and Nicholas of Cusa. He is editor of the book series "Ursprünge des Philosophierens" and the journal *Aufgang. Jahrbuch für Denken, Dichten, Musik*. His works include *Der Ursprung des Denkens bei Heraklit* (2001), *Gott als das offenbare Geheimnis nach Nikolaus von Kues* (2001), *Nicolaus Cusanus zwischen Deutschland und Italien. Beiträge eines deutsch-italienischen Symposions in der Villa Vigoni vom 28.3.-1.4.2001* (ed., 2002).